

RUSSIAN
IDEATIONAL ROOTS
OF JEWISH THOUGHT
AND HEBREW
LITERATURE



RUSSIAN
IDEATIONAL ROOTS
OF JEWISH THOUGHT
AND HEBREW
LITERATURE

Rina Lapidus

BOSTON
2024

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Lapidus, Rina, author.

Title: Russian ideational roots of Jewish thought and Hebrew literature /
Rina Lapidus.

Description: Boston : Academic Studies Press, 2024. | Includes
bibliographical references.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023046669 (print) | LCCN 2023046670 (ebook) | ISBN
9798887194011 (hardback) | ISBN 9798887194028 (adobe pdf) | ISBN
9798887194035 (epub)

Subjects: LCSH: Jewish literature--19th century--Russian influences. |
Jewish literature--20th century--Russian influences. | National
characteristics in literature. | Jews--Europe, Central--Intellectual
life. | Jews--Europe, Eastern--Intellectual life. | Hebrew
literature--19th century--Russian influences. | Hebrew literature--20th
century--Russian influences. | Ideology in literature. | LCGFT: Literary
criticism.

Classification: LCC PN842 .L37 2024 (print) | LCC PN842 (ebook) | DDC
809/.8921296--dc23/eng/20231019

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023046669>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023046670>

Copyright © Academic Studies Press, 2024

ISBN 9798887194011 (hardback)

ISBN 9798887194028 (adobe pdf)

ISBN 9798887194035 (epub)

Book design by Dina Nemirovsky

Cover design by Ivan Grave

On the cover: Jewish school students and teachers, Tokmak, 1900-1910
(fragment of a photograph).

Published by Academic Studies Press

1577 Beacon Street

Brookline, MA 02446, USA

press@academicstudiespress.com

www.academicstudiespress.com

If I forget you, O Jerusalem,
let my right hand forget its skill! (Psalm 137:5)

The book is dedicated to the city of Jerusalem, Israel,
my true motherland,
where I have spent the greater part of my life.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Russian Ideational Roots of the Jewish Enlightenment and Hebrew Literature	1
Part I: The Russian Roots of the National Ideas of the Jewish Enlightenment and Zionist Movements in the Russian Empire: Y. L. Gordon, Peretz Smolenskin, Y. L. Pinsker, Eliezer Ben-Yehuda	5
Chapter 1: Roots of the National Ideas of the Haskalah in the Russian Empire	6
1.1. Introduction	6
1.2. The Awakening of National Movements in Eastern Europe and in the Russian Empire	6
1.3. National Ideas in the Wake of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe and in Russia	8
1.4. The “Lovers of Wisdom” (Lyubomudry) Movement in Russia	9
1.5. The Slavophile Movement, the Russian “Soul,” A. A. Khomiakov	10
1.6. The Slavophiles, Peter the Great, and the Russian Orthodox Church	13
1.7. The Intellectual Circles of A. N. Ostrovsky and A. A. Grigoryev	14
1.8. The Russian “Soil” Movement	15
1.9. The Nationalistic Movements of Poles and Other Ethnic Minorities	16
1.10. Summary	18
Chapter 2: The Development of Jewish Nationalist Consciousness as Reflected in Scholarly Literature	19
2.1. European Nationalist Tendencies as the Background of Jewish National Awakening: Peretz Smolenskin, Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, Y. L. Pinsker	19
2.2. Jews as Seen by the Slavophiles	21
2.3. Alienation between the Russians and the Jews after the Pogroms of the 1880s	23

Chapter 3: A Comparison of the Views of Y. L. Gordon and Russian Thinkers	25
3.1. Y. L. Gordon as a Leading Figure of the Haskalah and His National Views	25
3.2. “A Flask of Feuilletons”, by Y. L. Gordon	26
3.3. The Jewish National Question in Y. L. Gordon’s View	28
3.4. Parallels between the National Ideas of the Haskalah and Those of the Nationalist Movements in Russia	29
3.5. The Uniqueness of the Russian People and of the Jewish People: Parallel Concepts	30
3.6. The Soul of the Nation Is Concealed and Unknowable to Foreigners	34
3.7. The National Pride That Our People Feel Due to Their Spiritual Power and Moral Strength	36
3.8. Foreigners—a Factor Causing Lack of Understanding between Peoples	36
3.9. Other Nations’ Lack of Understanding Towards Us Leads, in the Final Analysis, to Animosity	40
3.10. The Role of the Russians and of the Jews in Creating Negative Images in the Eyes of Foreign Nations	41
3.11. The Blind Wish to Imitate Everything Foreign, Both in Russian Society and among the Jewish Public	44
3.12. The Need to Preserve the Authentic National Language and to Develop It as a Basic Component of Nationalism	46
3.13. The Disaster of the Tower of Babel Confronts Every Nation That Foregoes the Preservation of Its Original National Language	48
3.14. The Need to Adopt the Accomplishments and Wisdom of Other Nations for the Benefit of Our People and to Advance Our National Goals	49
3.15. “Our People is Unable to Close the Gaps as Quickly as We Hoped”	52
3.16. Seeking the Proper Balance between the National and the Universal Dimension	53
3.17. Criticism of the Conservative Elements within Our People Who Are Not Prepared to Progress towards Enlightened Europe	55
3.18. Summary	56

Chapter 4: A Comparison between the National Views of Y. L. Pinsker and Those of Petr Chaadayev, Nikolai Berdyaev, and Vyacheslav Ivanov	57
4.1. L. S. Pinsker and His National Aspirations	57
4.2. Geography as the Most Important Factor in the Development of the Every Nation	57
4.3. The Degradation of Every People without a Clear National Agenda in the Eyes of Other Peoples	59
4.4. A Lack of a Solid Cultural Basis Related to the Lack of a National Agenda	60
4.5. The Place of a Nation among Other Nations	61
4.6. The Recognition of a Nation among Other Nations	63
4.7. The Weakness of National Consciousness in Different Peoples	63
4.8. A Nation's Lack of Self-Respect	63
4.9. False Expectations of a Miracle: Passivity, Nonintervention in Politics, and Subjection to the Influence of Others	64
4.10. Nikolai Berdyaev on the National Rights of the Russians and the Jews	66
4.11. Ways of National Revival	67
4.12. Conclusion: the Worldview of Chaadayev, Khomiakov, and the Slavophiles Versus that of Pinsker	69
 Part II: Russian Ideational Influences as Expressed in Hebrew Literary Works	 71
 Chapter 5: The Russian Theological Novel and Its Ideological Incarnation in Hebrew Literature	 72
5.1. The Primary Genres of the Novel in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Russian Literature	72
5.2. The Theological Novel in Russian Literature of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries	73
5.3. The Theological Novel in Comparison to the Ideological Novel in Hebrew Literature	77
5.4. The Theological Novella in Hebrew Literature: Chayyim Hazaz's <i>Shemuel Frankfurter</i>	78
5.5. The Ideological Elements in Hebrew Prose of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries	80

5.6. The Tendency to Replace Theological Motifs with Ideological Motifs in Hebrew Poetry	82
5.7. The Ideological Novel in Russian and Hebrew Literatures during the First Half of the Twentieth Century	85
5.8. Summary	88
Chapter 6: The Epic Poem <i>Songs of Glory</i> by Naphtali Herz Wessely	90
Introduction: The Unintended Parody Effect Produced by the Mixture of Literary Depictions and Religious Pathos	90
6.1. Generic Aspects of <i>Songs of Glory</i>	91
6.2. Violation of Generic Rules in <i>Songs of Glory</i>	94
6.3. Plot in Epic and in <i>Songs of Glory</i>	94
6.4. The Depiction of the Protagonist in the Epic and in <i>Songs of Glory</i>	95
6.5. The Figure of the Author and the Presentation of Chronological Order in Epic and in <i>Songs of Glory</i>	96
6.6. Epic and Dramatization	98
6.7. The Representation of Time in Epic	100
6.8. Epic and <i>Songs of Glory</i> : Between Pathos and Parody	101
6.9. Summary	104
Bibliography	106
Index	118

Introduction: Russian Ideational Roots of the Jewish Enlightenment and Hebrew Literature

Until now, there have been a number of studies dealing with the affinity of Hebrew literature to Russian and European literatures from the point of view of style and the way of structuring the narrative, but there have been few studies dealing with the affinity of Jewish Enlightenment and Hebrew literature to Russian and European literatures from the point of view of ideas. This book reveals, for the first time, the ideational influence of Russian thought of the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth century on the Jewish intellectual world in the Russian Empire as expressed in Jewish Enlightenment literature and later Hebrew literature. Until now it was believed that Jewish Enlightenment literature and Hebrew literature only adopted some external, but not inherent, features of Russian culture, such as poetic styles in literary works, literary genres, and types of polemics. In this book, I point to the conceptual ideas adopted by the Jewish thinkers and writers familiar with Russian philosophy and literature. I provide examples from the writings of Y. L. Gordon,¹ Peretz Smolenskin,² Y. L. Pinsker,³ N. H.

-
- 1 Yehuda Leib Gordon (1830–1892) was one of the most important Hebrew poets and publicists of the Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment) movement.
 - 2 Peretz Smolenskin (1842–1885) was a Zionist publicist and Hebrew writer in Russia, an active proponent of Jewish nationalism, interested in schemes for the colonization of Palestine. His Hebrew periodical, *The Dawn* (Ha-Shachar) was highly influential in these spheres.
 - 3 Yehuda Leib Pinsker (1821–1891), was a Russian Jew, a physician, a Zionist pioneer and activist, and the founder and leader of the Chovevei Zion movement, also known as Chibbat Zion. He authored the famous pamphlet *Auto-Emancipation*, subtitled “Warning to His Fellow People, from a Russian Jew” (Mahnruf an seine Stammgenossen, von einem russischen Juden, 1882), in which he urged the Jewish people to strive for independence and national consciousness.

Wessely,⁴ Y. Ch. Brenner,⁵ Ch. N. Bialik,⁶ Ya. Shteinberg,⁷ Y. D. Berkowitz,⁸ and Ch. Hazaz.⁹

The book consists of two parts. The first part is titled “The Russian Roots of the National Ideas of the Jewish Enlightenment and Zionist Movements in the Russian Empire.” This section deals with the concept of national identity as it was understood in various intellectual and social circles in Eastern Europe from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. In this period, a sense of national consciousness developed in various parts of Eastern Europe, where movements for national liberation began to emerge. The Jewish Enlightenment shared a number of spiritual characteristics with movements that sought their national identity in Russia and Eastern Europe. In the four chapters in this part of the book, I show that there are clear ideational parallels between the approaches to national issues among figures of the Jewish Enlightenment and those of Russian nationalist movements.

The second part is titled “Russian Ideational Influences as Expressed in Hebrew Literary Works.” The writers of Hebrew literature had a deeply respectful attitude to their religion. Judaism for them was the rock from which they were hewn and from which it was strictly forbidden to stray. While in other literatures writers sought “the righteous God” according to their understanding, speculated about the question of whether God really existed and what kind of God it was, the Jewish writers recoiled from such questions. For the Jewish writers, the answers to these and all other potential theological questions were already given in the traditional Jewish religious literature, and it was not fitting for them to desecrate the holy by raising heretical questions of this kind.

On the one hand, Jewish thinkers and writers wanted to be faithful to the Jewish religion and were not emotionally able, nor did they wish, to break

4 Naphtali Herz Wessely (Hartwig, 1725–1805) was a Haskalah poet, linguist, and exegete.

5 Yosef Chayyim Brenner (1881–1921) was a Russian-born Hebrew writer and essayist, one of the founders of the modern Hebrew literature.

6 Chayyim Nahman Bialik (1873–1934) was a Jewish poet, writer, essayist, translator, and editor, who wrote both in Hebrew and in Yiddish. Bialik was one of the pioneers of modern Hebrew poetry.

7 Yaakov Shteinberg (1887–1947) was a Ukrainian-born Hebrew poet and writer.

8 Yizhak Dov Berkowitz (1885–1967) was a Russian-born Hebrew writer and translator from Yiddish into Hebrew.

9 Chayyim Hazaz (1898–1973) was a Ukrainian-born Hebrew writer and essayist. There are many more examples of Russian influence on Hebrew literature not mentioned in the present work. See Dan Miron, ed., *Ha-chayyim be-apo shel ha-netzach: Yetzirato shel Uri Nisan Gnesin—chamisha machzorei yiyunim* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1997).

away from it. On the other, they learned from Russian thought and literature and sought to imitate them; they wanted to graze in foreign pastures and write literature of great moral and intellectual worth, like foreign literatures, and especially Russian. For that reason their attitude to Judaism was to some degree ambivalent. Adherence and fidelity to the Jewish religion limited the Jewish writers in absorbing the ideas and ways of writing accepted in foreign literatures. When the Jewish writers wrote about Judaism, their relationship was to a great extent Freudian. On the one hand, their devotion to the Jewish religion prevented them from developing a literature like other peoples, but on the other hand it was precisely their devotion to the Jewish religion that enabled them to develop a special literature, a Jewish literature of their own.

As I show in the first chapter in this section of the book, "The Russian Theological Novel and Its Ideological Incarnation in Hebrew Literature," Jewish writers created their national literature by focusing on spheres other than religion. While the authors of the Russian novels seek "the true God," in modern Hebrew literature, the authors pursue strategical and tactical objectives in the personal, cultural, social, or national realm, as against the theological realm. I assert, and bring proof, that, within the realm of Hebrew culture, which is deeply rooted in Jewish tradition, there is no place for the theological novel such as existed in Russian literature. Instead, the ideological novel developed, vigorous grew, and was widely accepted.

An example of profuse borrowings from foreign literature is given in the second chapter in this section of the book, which is titled "The Epic Poem Songs of Glory by Naphtali Herz Wessely." In this chapter I show that this poem presents a confused and inconsistent mixture of elements from various genres and styles, giving the effect of a parody, of course unintended by the author. At the same time, the writer shows great devotion to the Jewish tradition and religious enthusiasm, which seems grotesque in this epic poem.

In the final analysis, one can say that the thinkers of the Haskalah movement, the writers of the period of the Haskalah and of the later Hebrew literature were deeply influenced by Russian philosophical and religious thought even when unaware of it. They adopted ideational features of the Russian literature and incorporated them into their Hebrew works.

Part I: The Russian Roots of the National Ideas of the Jewish
Enlightenment and Zionist Movements in the Russian Empire:
Y. L. Gordon, Peretz Smolenskin, Y. L. Pinsker, Eliezer Ben-Yehuda

Chapter 1: Roots of the National Ideas of the Haskalah in the Russian Empire

1.1. Introduction

In this chapter I shall discuss the roots of awakening of national conscience in Eastern Europe. I shall address the concept of national identity as it was commonly understood in various intellectual and social circles in Eastern Europe from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. During this period, a sense of national consciousness developed in the various states and areas of Eastern Europe, thanks to which the initial stirrings of the movements for national liberation began to emerge.¹

1.2. The Awakening of National Movements in Eastern Europe and in the Russian Empire

Various peoples, and particularly the numerous ethnic minority groups within Eastern Europe, began to define the nature of their unique national identity from the mid-nineteenth century onwards. In light of these theoretical discussions, they attempted to realize in practice their political and cultural autonomy. The subject of national identity also received greater weight among central intellectual and social groups, as compared to other values—such as religion and its institutions, monarchy, tradition, and arts—which had previously stood at the head of the scale of values in these societies. Such values were no longer considered absolute and primary criteria of spiritual and social life, but were examined and evaluated anew, from a nationalist viewpoint. Whereas the practical manner of realizing these moods in a well-formulated theory of national identity varied from one ethnic group to another, the phenomena as such, with its basic principles, was shared by most of the groups. I intend to discuss the nationalist tendencies in Russia during the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first quarter of the twentieth century, which served as the background for similar tendencies in Jewish society and culture.

1 Jan Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815–1849*, ed. and introd. Lawrence D. Orton (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1986), 6–9.

The awakening of interest in unique Russian national identity finds striking expression in Russian journalism throughout the nineteenth century. While the first kernels of ideas related to Russian national identity already appeared even before the Romantic period, their development is only recognizable later, during the Romantic period in Europe, at the end of the eighteenth century and thereafter. These ideas left their impression upon literature as well as other areas of social thought and philosophy. The Romantics laid the cornerstones for studying the culture of nations, thereby paving the way for a widely accepted understanding of national identity; at times, they also expressed their own national uniqueness and promoted the idea of national liberation. The spread of Romantic ideas was thus closely involved with the awakening of the movements for national liberation in Europe.

The dissemination of ideas originating in the Romantic movement received a new growth within the national movements of Eastern Europe and Russia. The tendency to emphasize the uniqueness of national and ethnic cultures, and in doing so to affirm the uniqueness and independence of the various ethnic groups, naturally led to a new perception of national and ethnic history and folklore as valuable sources of national culture.²

Such an approach attributes a unique singularity to the fate and function of each nation.³ The components of culture—philosophy, belles-lettres, journalism—became further sources for studying the “spirit of the nation.” The progress of nations and their achievements in various areas were understood as interwoven with their consciousness of their unique national identity.

There are two aspects to the study of national identity: the social-class aspect, and the historical aspect. In terms of the former, the lower classes were perceived as the storehouse of national uniqueness. From the historical aspect, the past was understood as the period during which the unique national spirit flourished and in which it was embodied.⁴

The interest in national identity among the broad Russian public arose, to a large extent, in wake of the war with Napoleon’s armies and their defeat in 1812. For instance, Russian literature after this war became very involved in the ideological process of seeking out the roots of Russian national identity.⁵

2 Olga Litvak, *Haskalah: The Romantic Movement in Judaism* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2012).

3 Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia*, 3–6.

4 Ibid., 9, 30.

5 Robert A. Kann and Zdenek V. David, *The Peoples of the Eastern Habsburg Lands, 1526–1918* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984), 201, 213–214, 250, 364.

1.3. National Ideas in the Wake of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe and in Russia

Following the Napoleonic wars, German idealistic philosophy exerted great influence upon the intelligentsia in Russia, an influence that was to leave its mark on all levels of Russian society. Schelling and Hegel were the two main thinkers, the “rulers of thought” in the eyes of Russian intellectuals. Their respective views were markedly different from one another and they influenced two different streams within Russian intellectual society. In his later thought, Schelling distanced himself from the rationalist approach and preferred the “divine revelation”—that is, the philosophical and mystical perception of religion. He therefore sharply criticized Hegel’s thought because of its excessive rationalism, and accused it of giving legitimacy to a rationalist approach.⁶

The worldview of these two thinkers provided the basis for the two leading tendencies within Russian thought—the Western tendency and the Slavophile one. In the eyes of those who supported the Western tendency, Hegel was the symbol of truth and progress;⁷ whereas other members of the Russian intelligentsia turned toward Schelling, under whose inspiration the Slavophile tendency took shape. Moreover, in his teaching they found support for their ideological break with Europe. Specifically, they drew from Schelling’s thought the idea that each nation has a task and destiny defined for it by Divine power—and that this alone is the reason and purpose for its very existence.⁸

The young Russian intellectuals sought to shape a philosophy and mystical perception of their own based upon the German model. They saw themselves as the future reformers of Russian culture and as the shapers of Russian thought.⁹ Their aim was to set up a completely new system of overarching values, which would be accepted as absolute, eternal, stable, and lasting. These would be adopted alongside what they perceived as the traditional values of Russian national identity, and would replace the existing world order that was not rooted in the depths of Russian national consciousness.

The discussion of the nature of the Russian nation, while stressing its unique characteristics, was part of an intensive process of growing involvement

6 A. M. Peskov, “U istokov russkogo filosofstvovaniia: Shellingianskie tainstva liubomudrov,” *Voprosy filosofii* 5 (1994): 89–100.

7 P. V. Annenkov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, intro. V. I. Kuleshov, notes A. M. Dolotova, G. G. Elizavetina, I. V. Mann, and I. B. Pavlova (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1983), 76–77.

8 A. V. Gulyga, *Schelling* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1982), 298–300.

9 Peskov, “Shellingianskie tainstva liubomudrov,” 92.

with the subject of national identity at that time—which to a large extent is to be attributed to the intellectual influence of Western philosophical ideas that had penetrated into Russia from Europe. In other words, the process of seeking national roots in Russia was part of a general process that was occurring in Eastern Europe, which over the course of time led to the creation and development of national liberation movements.¹⁰

1.4. The “Lovers of Wisdom” (Lyubomudry) Movement in Russia

The above-described process, unlike its Western parallels, was characterized by extreme individualism in interpretation of Russian national identity. In Russia, the process began with the organization of a group known as the “Lovers of Wisdom” (Lyubomudry), led by Prince Vladimir Odoevsky, whose members were the forbearers of both the Westernizing and the Slavophile movements. From the 1820s onwards, this group discusses questions regarding the unique national path of Russia, the meaning of its existence, and the aim of the Russian people in light of its world-historical background—ideas that originated in the earlier circles of young Russian writers and intellectuals influenced by Romanticism.

The goal of this group was of a patriotic nature—namely, to bring practical benefit to Russia. Dmitry Venevitinov,¹¹ one of the leaders of the group, defined the life goal of every Russian citizen in terms of the desire “to act with persistence and stubbornness of mind to bring benefit to his people.” The Lovers of Wisdom defined their approach as “the journey to self-knowledge” unique to each nation—this, under the inspiration of the thought of Schelling, whose strong influence was recognizable in their society. They saw in this journey to self-knowledge the goal of mankind, one of the ways of spreading the Enlightenment.¹²

Already at the beginning of their path, the Lovers of Wisdom assumed as self-evident that the process of self-knowledge in Russia was different from its parallels in other nations. The basic ideas of Russian Enlightenment and philosophy during the period preceding that of the Lovers of Wisdom were

10 N. A. Berdiaev, *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov: Ocherk* (Moscow: Tipografiia A. I. Mamontova, 1912; reprinted: Farnborough: Gregg Publishing House, 1971), 7–10.

11 Dmitry Vladimirovich Venevitinov (1805–1827) was a Russian Romantic poet who died at the age of twenty-one. Venevitinov and his friends were the young idealists who introduced into Russia the cult of Goethe and Schelling’s metaphysics. See D. V. Venevitinov, *Stikhotvoreniia. Proza* (Moscow: Nauka, 1980), 129.

12 Ibid., 232–234.

borrowed from other European peoples, and received their great impetus primarily after the pro-Western reforms of Czar Peter I (the Great).¹³ According to the Lovers of Wisdom, the self-knowledge of the Russian people had been distorted from the outset because, rather than coming to know their own culture, they turned their back to it and copied the European ways of life. For that reason, they thought, one needs to alter the course of development of Enlightenment in Russia to return to the sources of Russia itself, so that “the nature of the nation will develop through its own power, in its own authentic and original way, characteristic of itself alone.”¹⁴

1.5. The Slavophile Movement, the “Russian Soul,” A. A. Khomiakov

The doctrine of the Lovers of Wisdom was, in practice, the earliest Russian ideology, free of imitation, upon which the Slavophile movement was based.¹⁵ The Slavophile movement, notwithstanding the fact that it united various distinct and separate tendencies, embodied a consistent understanding of Russia’s unique national path. This was expressed in various publications in the areas of philosophy and religion written in opposition to German philosophy, which was understood as an alien way of thought, even though this movement in fact drew upon many of its ideas. This may be seen in the writings of such Russian thinkers as Khomiakov, Kireyevsky,¹⁶ the brothers Aksakov,¹⁷ Yu. Samarin,¹⁸ and S. Shevyrev,¹⁹ who were the acknowledged leaders of the Slavophile movement.

13 Peter I (the Great; 1672–1726; reigned 1682–1726) was one of the most important Russian leaders of all times. He introduced many reforms in order to advance Russia and bring it closer to the developed countries of Europe; he founded and built the city of St. Petersburg, which is named after him.

14 Venevitinov, *Stikhotvoreniia. Proza*, 129.

15 Berdiaev, *Khomiakov*, 2–6.

16 Ivan Vasilyevich Kireyevsky (1806–1856) was a Russian literary critic and philosopher. Together with Aleksei Khomiakov, he cofounded the Slavophile movement.

17 Ivan Sergeyevich Aksakov (1823–1886) was a Russian writer and one of the founders of the Slavophile movement.

18 Yuri Fedorovich Samarin (1819–1976) was a leading Slavophile thinker and one of the promoters of the Emancipation reform of the 1861. He befriended another Slavophile, Konstantin Aksakov, from an early age. Samarin was an ardent admirer of Hegel and Khomiakov. See N. I. Tsimbareva, “Vstuplenie,” in Iu. F. Samarin, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia*, ed. N. I. Tsimbareva (Moscow: Moskovskii filosofskii fond, 1996), 3–22.

19 Stepan Petrovich Shevyrev (1806–1864) was a Russian literary critic, literary historian, and poet, member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences (1847). He was a member of the Society of Lovers of Wisdom.

The leaders of this movement were among the first to express in a coherent and systematic way the ideas that were widespread in the social environment in those days. Their worldview served as an influential ideological framework for the thinkers of the following generations, which was felt throughout the course of the nineteenth century.²⁰ Towards the beginning of the 1840s the Slavophile tendency took shape as an explicitly ideological movement, against the background of polemics with other ideological movements—especially the Westernizing movements.²¹

As noted above, Khomiakov was considered a central figure in Russian society, serving as the spokesman of the social, literary, and religious thought in Russia during the 1840s. Berdiaev described him as “the strongest, most versatile, and most active figure in the Slavophile movement, who in his writings gave expression to the religious doctrine of the Slavophiles, their philosophy, their historical point of view, and their publicistics.”²² Khomiakov’s thought embodied the basic assumptions defining Russian national identity, with its unique characteristics. He redefined the concept of Russia national identity, thereby laying the basis for the concept of the “Russian soul.”²³ He wrote:

Have we indeed fully understood the concept of the nation—which is the true, exclusive and eternal creator of the course of world history? Have we indeed derived the conclusion called for, that each nation has a face of its own, like a living person? It is that which determines the fate of the states in which these peoples live, and which elevates its name by virtue of the righteous, sublime truth planted deep in its

20 Berdiaev, *Khomiakov*, 7.

21 A. I. Gertsen, *Byloe i dumy* (Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1947), 272–275.

22 Berdiaev, *Khomiakov*, 24–25.

23 The term “Russian soul” has been used in literature and thought to describe Russian spirituality. Depth, strength, and compassion are general characteristics of the Russian soul. The term and the concept of Russian soul arose in the 1840s with the advent of German Romantic literature in Russia, again under the influence of Hegel and Schelling. Schelling introduced the concept of a “world soul,” meaning the potential for a creative connection between humanity and the divine. Hegel formulated a conception of collective, national soul. The ideas of Schelling and Hegel formed the ideologies of the Slavophiles and Westernizers, which both cultivated a bold new nationalism. The Slavophiles drew upon Hegel’s “national spirit” to form the concept of a “Russian spirit” embodied by the peasantry. Their idea of “Russian soul” represented the desire to seek Russia’s greatness in its pre-Petrine past.

roots—or that, on the contrary, may send it to a wasteland, condemn it to devastation, destroy and ruin them.²⁴

Khomiakov championed the idea that each nation has its own unique character and destiny—his main concern being the recognition of the uniqueness of the Russian people. Each and every nation is required, according to his approach, to define for itself its goal and to invest the necessary efforts to realize it. The goal of the Russian people, in Khomiakov's view, is of a religious-ethical character; therefore the way towards true understanding of its goal will be paved for the Russian people if it brings about an “ethical revolution,” to use his language—but only after suitable moral purification that includes regret for its sins, and persistence in strict self-education.²⁵

Khomiakov was a significant figure in the Russian socio-cultural milieu of his day. His influence upon the Russian intellectuals was considerable even beyond his time. He issued a call to the enlightened Russian intelligentsia to play an active role in the life of the lower classes of the people and in their reeducation. His influence may be recognized even in the case of those who disagreed with his ideological path and were forced to confront his opinions, such as A. Herzen,²⁶ Khomiakov's ideological rival, who still admired his comprehension of things and his personal talents. Khomiakov shaped the Slavophile movement from its outset and to a large extent determined the course of its development. The theoretical manifesto of this stream proclaimed the rebellion against Western culture and the absolute reverence for authentic Russian culture.²⁷

The Slavophiles claimed that their ancient original Russian roots were to be found in the doctrine of the Russian Orthodox Church, which they saw as the symbol of the Russian spirit, realized in the Russian people. The Slavophiles saw the Russian people as the standard-bearer for the unity of all the sectors of Christianity, and as the future spiritual leader of all mankind, its ultimate goal being the creation of worldwide brotherhood on earth. They believed that the esoteric spiritual unity of the monarchy and of the authentic Russian people, that is, of the simple folk, makes Russia into a singularly unified world, totally different from the West.

24 A. A. Levandovskii, *Vremia Granovskogo. U istokov formirovaniia russkoi intelligentsii* (Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1990), 167.

25 A. S. Khomiakov, *Izbrannye sochineniia*, ed. and intro. N. S. Arsen'ev (New York: Chekhov Publishers, 1955), 320; G. P. Fedotov, *Sud'ba i grekhi Rossii* (St. Petersburg: Sofiia, 1991).

26 Aleksandr Ivanovich Herzen (1812–1870) was a Russian writer and thinker known as the “father of Russian socialism.” Herzen was among the main representatives of the Westernizers' ideology in Russia.

27 See Gertsen, *Byloe i dumy*, 271.

1.6. The Slavophiles, Peter the Great, and the Russian Orthodox Church

Towards the middle of the nineteenth century, the polemic concerning the uniqueness of the Russian people encompassed all areas of social thought. Disputes in various directions took shape surrounding the subject of “Russia vs. Western culture.” Two basic approaches took shape: one that claimed the superiority of Russia over the West (Slavophiles), and the other that saw it as inferior (Westerners).

In seeking the roots of the uniqueness of Russia against Europe, the Slavophiles turned to the period preceding Peter I and his innovations, when, in their view, the original, authentic way of life of old Russia still existed. The Slavophiles likewise turned to the tradition of the simple Russian folk, who preserved—according to their lights—approaches and customs from ancient times. They created a kind of hypothetical, utopian and idealistic picture of pre-Petrine Russia. Russia’s past, during the age preceding Peter the Great, was depicted as a mystical and religious period enshrouded in holiness, a time during which the connection between the Russian people and its God was unmediated and pure. According to their ideological vision—which had no chance of being realized in reality—the Russian people shall again take shelter beneath the wings of the Orthodox Church and return to their “pure” national sources. This utopian picture was largely based extent upon the messianic doctrine that was widespread in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, according to which Orthodox Russia has a unique destiny—to serve as a new center of spiritual revelation and a source of ethical and cultural inspiration, which in the course of time will lead Moscow to the status of “the Third Rome.”²⁸

In this context one ought to mention the role of literary criticism in journalistic polemics. Literary critics were of particular significance in Russian society. Due to the absence of a tradition of journalistic polemics, due to various limitations, such as strict censorship, articles of literary criticism as well as those concerning matters of religion, ethics, philosophy, and aesthetics served as a kind of substitute for journalism. These publications included ideas in the realms of

28 The idea that the Orthodox Church is leading Moscow to become the “Third Rome” is a theological, historiosophical, and political concept, which claims that Moscow is the successor of the Roman Empire and Byzantium in being the world center of the Christian faith. See about this concept: Donald Ostrowski, “‘Moscow the Third Rome’ as Historical Ghost,” in *Byzantium, Faith, and Power (1261–1557): Perspectives on Late Byzantine Art and Culture*, ed. Sara T. Brooks (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006), 170–179; P. P. Kravchenko, *Sviataia Rus’. Istoricheskaia missiia, natsional’naia ideia, forma pravleniia* (Moscow: Vozrozhdenie, 2014).

education, nationalism, civil society as well as discussions of the possibilities of future developments of Russia.

From the 1840s onward, ideas concerning the nature of the Russian nation were developed within the framework of the polemics conducted between the Slavophiles and the supporters of a Western-oriented approach, such as V. Belinsky,²⁹ T. Granovsky,³⁰ A. Herzen,³¹ I. Turgenev,³² and I. Kireyevsky.³³

1.7. The Intellectual Circles of A. N. Ostrovsky and A. A. Grigoryev

In the 1850s, particularly following Russia's defeat in the Crimean War,³⁴ which revealed the impotence of the Russian government, there developed a lack of trust in the government, and a general atmosphere of disappointment and disquiet. The years after the defeat were called "the dark years." During that period, there arose in Moscow, as a counterbalance to this general mood, the group of A. N. Ostrovsky³⁵ and A. A. Grigoryev,³⁶ which advocated an idealistic, patriotic,

29 Vissarion Grigoryevich Belinsky (1811–1848) was a Russian literary critic of Westernizing tendency.

30 Timofey Nikolayevich Granovsky (1813–1855) was a founder of medieval studies in the Russian Empire. Granovsky studied at the universities of Moscow and Berlin, where he was profoundly influenced by Hegelian ideas. He felt that Western history was superior to that of his own country and became the first Russian to deliver courses on the medieval history of Western Europe (1839). His ideas brought him in touch with other Westernizers. His attitude toward Slavophiles was critical and even offending.

31 See Herzen's opinion concerning the dispute between the Slavophiles and Westerners: Gertsen, *Byloe i dumy*, 284–285.

32 Ivan Sergeyevich Turgenev (1818–1883) was a Russian writer and playwright. Between 1838 and 1841 Turgenev studied philosophy at the University of Berlin, particularly that of Hegel, and history. Turgenev was impressed with German society and returned home believing that Russia could best improve itself by incorporating ideas of the German Enlightenment.

33 Ivan Vasilyevich Kireyevsky (1806–1856) was a Russian literary critic and philosopher. Together with Aleksei Khomiakov, he founded the Slavophile movement. On Kireyevsky's opinion concerning the desirable path for the Russian nation, see I. V. Kirievskii, *Kritika i estetika* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979), 333–334.

34 In the Crimean War (1853–1856), Russia lost to an alliance of France, Britain, the Ottoman Empire, and Sardinia.

35 Aleksandr Nikolayevich Ostrovsky (1823–1886) was a Russian playwright generally considered the greatest representative of the Russian realistic period. His dramas were united by the ideas and the spirit of Russian national revival (*narodnost'*). Ostrovsky, initially a Westernizer, slowly drifted towards Slavophilia.

36 Apollon Aleksandrovich Grigoryev (1822–1864) was a Russian poet, literary and theatrical critic, translator, and memoirist.

and nationalistic line. The members of this group and its supporters expressed great interest in the studies of Russian art and culture and in the nature of the Russian soul and the spirit of the people, which pulsed in the heart of each member. This group encouraged belief in the ideal wholeness of the simple Russian folk and in the spirit of the Russian people, calling to liberate the Russian soul, and its members disseminated this belief in the public. They even had their own symbol for the “Russian soul,” which they themselves fashioned and designed.³⁷

Grigoryev thought that the works of the Russian writers and poets embodied the Russian national character: in his eyes Ostrovsky symbolized rootedness; Gogol—the ideal of the Orthodox Church; and Pushkin—national harmony.³⁸ He was unable to properly value the works of Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, only some of which he knew (as he died in 1864), and hence was unable to appreciate their great importance.

1.8. The Russian “Soil” Movement

At the beginning of the 1860s the periodicals *Vremia* (Time) and *Epokha* (Age), edited by Mikhail Dostoyevsky and his brother, the author Fyodor Dostoyevsky, enjoyed a wide circulation. These periodicals supported the social movement that in the course of time came to be known as “Pochvenichestvo” (the “soil” movement). According to the manifesto of the movement, which also reflected the personality of Fyodor Dostoyevsky, the Russian intelligentsia was charged with drawing close to the simple people, to the peasants—that is, the men of the soil—who were specifically the “guardians of the spark” of true and authentic Russian uniqueness.³⁹

In practice, the “soil” movement expressed some of the ideas of the Slavophiles, albeit in a different way. This movement did not have a well-formulated doctrine, but presented an outline of its idea, one that was shared by the Slavophiles, on the one hand, and the supporters of the Western approach, on the other. In other words, the new movement did not deny, in principle, the Western-looking tendency—notwithstanding its differences from it—but advocated a kind of synthesis, which it believed could be attained by means of close cooperation among the various social levels—namely, the intelligentsia and the simple people. An integration between the cultural values that had been

37 S. N. Nosov, *Apollon Grigor'ev. Sud'ba i tvorchestvo* (Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990), 80.

38 A. A. Grigor'ev, *Iskusstvo i npravstvennost'* (Moscow: Sovremennik, 1986), 76–78.

39 F. M. Dostoevskii, *Dnevnik pisatel'ia, 1873*, in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh*, vol. 21 (Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1980), 54.

adopted by the intelligentsia and the ethical values found among the simple Russian people was the only way that could lead, in their opinion, to the true advancement of Russia.

Dostoyevsky's ideas, in the spirit of the "soil" movement, found expression in a series of articles about Russian literature published in *Vremia* in 1861. His first articles in this series expressed opinions similar to those found Khomiakov's essays, "The Opinion of Foreigners about Russia" (1845) and "The Russian's Opinions of Foreigners" (1846; both these articles shall be discussed below). In his own articles Dostoyevsky claims, with a note of sorrow and pathos, that the Russian people is a unique phenomenon. There is no other people in the world, in his view, that resembles the Russian nation, for which reason other peoples are unable to fully understand the Russian ideas or the Russian national soul. Dostoyevsky was troubled by the possibility that the Russian people would forego the cultivation of their own unique national element, an idea about which he wrote extensively. He was close to Khomiakov and shared many of his views; like Khomiakov, he harshly criticized Russian emigrants living outside the country, who aided in the creation of distorted views circulating about the Russian nation.⁴⁰

Between the 1860s and 1880s, Russian society was deeply occupied with discussion of the nature of the Russian people, thereby expressing the general atmosphere and various social tendencies in Russia and in Eastern Europe generally. This subject was discussed by A. Herzen, in his article "The Russian Germans and the German Russians" (1859),⁴¹ as well as by M. Saltykov-Shchedrin in the periodical *Sovremennik* (Contemporary), where he wrote a regular column on "Our Social Life."⁴² During the 1860s and thereafter this discussion assumed a new character as it was incorporated within the growing activity of the movements for national liberation that emerged and developed rapidly throughout Eastern Europe (detailed below).

1.9. The Nationalistic Movements of Poles and Other Ethnic Minorities

The great rebellion of the Poles against the tyrannical rule of Russia broke out in 1863–1864. In its wake, an intense debate appeared in Russian journalism, known as "the Polish Problem," which revolved around the question of the nature of the Polish people. This polemic supported the right of the Russians to

40 Ibid., 120.

41 The article was reprinted as a brochure: A. I. Gertsen, *Russkie nemtsy i nemetskie russkie* (Moscow: Direkt-Media, 2012).

42 M. E. Saltykov-Shchedrin, "Nasha obshchestvennaia zhizn', 1863–1864," in his *Sobranie sochinenii v dvadtsati tomakh* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965–1977), 255.

rule over the territory of Poland, emphasizing the need for this. N. Strakhov⁴³ argued for the superiority of the Russian national idea above the European one. He wrote in the Slavophile spirit about the authentic Russian Orthodox culture, which was in his eyes fresh, strong, and more elevated and sublime than the arrogant and moribund Catholic civilization—albeit acknowledging that even Catholic civilization had a unique character of its own.⁴⁴ On the other hand, the Russian author I. S. Aksakov justified the Polish rebels. He accepted the theory, widespread in Russian thought, that the source of the constant conflicts among the Slavic peoples was primarily religious—that is, the tension between the Russian Orthodoxy and the Polish Catholicism. Hence, while he did not justify the rebellion, he advocated spiritual and political autonomy for Poland.⁴⁵

For years, the Russian understanding of their own national character had been largely of a mystical-religious nature, focusing upon the internal Russian aspect. From the time of the Polish rebellion, a change took place in this approach. Now, the issue was discussed primarily in relation to the problem of the nationality of the Slavic peoples surrounding Russia (and particularly the problems of the ethnic minorities in Eastern Europe).

As mentioned, the deliberations about the nature of the separate nationalism of various peoples, as well as the practical expressions of this question—that is, the activity on behalf of national liberation—arose among different nations and not only in Poland. A search for national identity, in various forms and expressions, also emerged among other peoples and ethnic minorities in Eastern Europe from the end of the eighteenth century and particularly during the course of the nineteenth century. Several striking examples of national movements of this type, which in their platforms combined theoretical discussion of the nature of the nation alongside practical activities intended for national liberation: the Galician Ukrainians under Austrian rule;⁴⁶

43 Nikolai Nikolayevich Strakhov (1828–1896) was a Russian philosopher, publicist, and literary critic. Strakhov was also one of the most prominent opponents of liberalism, rationalism, and utilitarianism in Russia. He contributed to the development of traditionalist Slavophile ideology and its nationalist variant known as Pochvennichestvo. In 1883 Nikolai Strakhov published his famous book *The Struggle against the West in Russian Literature*.

44 See B. F. Egorov, *Bor'ba esteticheskikh idei v Rossii serediny 1860-kh godov* (Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1991), 303–318.

45 Quoted from *ibid.*, 164.

46 Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia*, 15–16, 29–30, 51; John-Paul Himka, *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century* (Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1988), 26.

the Hungarian minority movement under Polish rule;⁴⁷ the Czech sector⁴⁸ and other minorities in the Habsburg Empire, such as the Slovenians,⁴⁹ the Magyars,⁵⁰ and the Croatians;⁵¹ the Romanian movement in Transylvania;⁵² the national movement of the Bulgarians;⁵³ the German-speaking minorities in Eastern Europe and East-Central Europe,⁵⁴ and manifestations of national consciousness among the Hungarian minority there.⁵⁵

1.10. Summary

In what I wrote above, I surveyed the various approaches, movements, organizations, and nationalist parties that were widespread in Eastern Europe from the second half of the nineteenth through the beginning of the twentieth century. Eastern Europe was filled with an atmosphere of nationalism, a trait that was particularly noticeable among its numerous ethnic minorities. This was particularly striking in the Russian Empire, in which a nationalist atmosphere filled the press, the public discussions in private homes and in government offices, among student circles at the universities, among the intellectuals and elite circles, and among army officers. The pervasive spirit of nationalist quest in the Russian Empire was felt also among Jews, particularly among those of them who knew Russian, read the Russian press, and were involved in the social and cultural life of Russia, such as Y. L. Gordon, Y. L. Pinsker, and Peretz Smolenskin.

47 Eligiusz Kozłowski, "The Polish Nation and the Hungarian Revolution of 1848–1849," in *East Central European Society and War in the Era of Revolutions, 1775–1856*, ed. Bela K. Kiraly (New York: Brooklyn College Press, 1984), 578–590.

48 Kann and David, *The Peoples of the Eastern Habsburg Lands*, 201–202.

49 Ibid., 214–215.

50 Ibid., 228–235.

51 Ibid., 265–267.

52 Keith Hitchins, *The Idea of Nation: The Romanians of Transylvania, 1692–1849* (Bucharest: Encyclopaedic Publishing House, 1985), 141, 172.

53 Thomas Albert Meiniger, *The Formation of a Nationalist Bulgarian Intelligentsia, 1835–1878* (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1974), 61–119, 142.

54 Lothar Dralle, *Die Deutschen in Ostmittel- und Osteuropa: Ein Jahrtausend europäischer Geschichte* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991), 177, 192, 369; Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy, *Die europäischen Revolutionen und der Charakter der Nationen* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1951), 407.

55 Sandor Biro, *The Nationalities Problem in Transylvania, 1867–1940: A Social History of the Romanian Minority under Hungarian Rule, 1867–1918 and of the Hungarian Minority under Romanian Rule, 1918–1940*, trans. M. D. Fenyo (Highland Lakes, NJ: East European Monographs, 1992), 81, 309, 443, 619.

Chapter 2: The Development of Jewish Nationalist Consciousness as Reflected in Scholarly Literature

2.1. European Nationalist Tendencies as the Background of Jewish National Awakening: Peretz Smolenskin, Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, Y. L. Pinsker

Jewish national consciousness began to develop in Jewish literature, primarily in the early Haskalah literature, when the national spirit already pervaded Russian journalism. From its very beginnings, Haskalah literature sought to come closer, in culture, language, and economic activities, to the peoples among whom the Jews lived. Together with this longing, the Jewish “Enlightenment” scholars (representatives of the Haskalah movement, called also “Maskilim”) were aware of the religious and national difference of the Jews from their neighbors.

The linguistic barrier that divided the Jewish and the Russian public prevented the penetration of ideas that were already well developed in the Russian journalism, literature, and society, into the Jewish world. Nevertheless, in the second half of the nineteenth century there began to develop a substantive closeness between Jews and non-Jews, mostly on the part of the Maskilim. It was supported by the analogy between the processes that were developed in Russian society and between those that began to develop—or, more precisely, that the Maskilim wished to see develop—among the Jews.

Tendencies that characterized the peoples of Europe during the 1860s and 70s now began to serve as an example and a proof of the legitimacy of Jewish national particularism, which left its mark primarily in the area of cultivating the Hebrew language and the longing for political independence in the future. Peretz Smolenskin developed his theory in this spirit. He pointed out tendencies that were parallel or contradictory conflicting in manners of development of the national consciousness, and argued there was an analogy between the national sentiments of the Jewish people and the awakening of European nations and minorities, primarily of those nations that were included in the framework of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. The historical experience of the European nations during their struggles for political and cultural independence served, for Smolenskin, as a model and an example for cultivation of the national consciousness of the Jewish people in Europe. He noted that attaining political

independence was seemingly impossible for the small nations of Europe in the nineteenth century, but it became possible due to their determination.

On the pages of Smolenskin's monthly *Ha-Shahar* (Dawn), there was published in 1879 the short but very influential essay by Eliezer Ben-Yehuda, "A Weighty Question."¹ While Ben-Yehuda's main enterprise was carried out years later, by the time of writing this article he had already read Smolenskin's central works that had been published to that date in *Ha-Shahar*. He also adopted, in both theory and practice, Smolenskin's analogic approach, which he used to discuss the content of the nationalist tendencies that had arisen among the European peoples.

Ben-Yehuda's worldview stands out particularly for stressing the legitimacy of the differences of language among various nations, which is on the order of natural laws. Ben-Yehuda also calls for a return to, and revival of, the Hebrew language and its cultivation in the present time. As a logical conclusion of the revival of the Hebrew language, according to the custom of those nations who dwell on their soil, he calls on Jews to resettle the land of Israel and to realize therein the dream of speaking their own language, just like the other nations.

About five years after Ben-Yehuda's publication, and after Smolenskin's explanations of the Jewish condition, a new vision of the nationalist revival was given in 1882, on the verge of the formation of Chibbat Zion. It was a work in the German language, called *Auto-Emancipation*, by Yehuda Leib Pinsker. The author explained that the Jewish people lacked the regular characteristics of an accepted nation, which was the cause for antisemitism.

To summarize, the development of Jewish national consciousness began to take shape at a later period than among the European nations, a phenomenon confirming the assumption that the Haskalah was influenced by European and, to a great deal, Russian nationalist ideas. For the purposes of our research, it is important to note that the beginning of the Jewish national revival came about, to a certain extent, in the wake of Russian nationalism and that of other minorities in Eastern Europe. However, the nature and substance of Jewish nationalism was different from the parallel developments among the other nations.²

1 Eliezer Ben-Yehudah (1858–1922) was the driving spirit behind the revival of the Hebrew language in the modern era.

2 See Brian Horowitz, *Jewish Nationalism and Acculturation in 19th- and Early 20th-Century Russia* (New Orleans: Tulane University Press, 2009); idem, *Russian Idea—Jewish Presence: Essays on Russian-Jewish Intellectual Life* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2013); Henrietta Mondry, *Exemplary Bodies: Constructing the Jew in Russian Culture since the 1880s* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2009); Harriet Murav and Eugene Avrutin, eds., *Jews in the East European Borderlands: Essays in Honor of John Klier* (Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2011).

2.2. Jews as Seen by the Slavophiles

Joseph Klausner, the historian of Haskalah literature, mentions briefly the ideological split, in Russian literature and among Russian authors and thinkers, between the “Westernizers” under Khomiakov (Zapadniki) and the “Slavophiles” Khomiakov under Aksakov, and the preaching of the latter on the topic of “Great Russia.”³ Klausner notes, in an aside, that “even the Russian Slavophiles, who were seemingly remote from Judaism, penetrated into Hebrew literature, and their impression may be seen in the conservative works—both nationalistic and religious—of Zweifel⁴ and Pines⁵.” Klausner alludes on several occasions to the paradoxical and unconscious connection between the main representatives of the Slavophile movement and the Haskalah literature during the 1860s, which was the time of the nationalistic turn, or transformation, among the Jews of Russia.

However, Klausner’s remarks, which were published more than sixty years ago, require a more principled and fundamental clarification. In fact, there were substantial differences and even oppositions between the Slavophile movement in Russia, which was essentially conservative and regressive, and the stance of the Jews, which was progressive and supported development and modernization. This is the view proposed by the major scholar of the history of the Jews in Russia, Samuel Ettinger, who reveals a picture of intense enmity towards the Jews on the part of the Russian nationalists in his article “The Ideological Background of the New Antisemitic Literature in Russia.”⁶

Ettinger conducts a careful study of the writings of the main Slavophile authors, such as Khomiakov. Ettinger describes Khomiakov’s outlook as reflected in article written by the latter in 1847, titled “Impressions Regarding National History,” in which Khomiakov states that: “The Jew after Jesus is a living absurdity, for he has no existence of rational sense and therefore has no value in the historical world.” He goes on concerning the Jewish people and their characteristic qualities: “This is a people without a homeland; it is

3 Yosef Klausner, *Ha-historia shel ha-sifrut he-yivrit he-chadasha* (Jerusalem: Achiasaf, 1936–1950), vol. 4, 120.

4 Eliezer Zweifel Ha-Kohen (1815–1888) was a prolific writer in Hebrew and Yiddish, defender of Hasidism.

5 Yehiel Michael Pines (“Michal”; 1843–1913), was a writer and an early exponent of religious Zionism. Pines believed that Jewish life should be reformed, but he was opposed to religious reforms that would undermine the foundations of tradition and increase assimilation. Pines was foremost a thinker, writer, and craftsman of the Hebrew language. About him, see Klausner, *Ha-historia shel ha-sifrut he-yivrit*, vol. 6, 513.

6 Shemuel Ettinger, “Ha-reka ha-ideologi le-hofa’a shel ha-sifrut ha-antishemit he-chadasha be-Rusia,” *Tzion* 35 (1970): 193–225.

a genetic sequence of the commercial spirit of ancient Palestine; and, in particular, it embodies a love for worldly benefit which, even in ancient times, could not recognize the Messiah in his poverty and humility.”⁷

Khomiakov’s follower Ivan Aksakov, one of the leading spokesmen for the Slavophiles, continues in this hostile spirit, noting that: “I am unable to free myself from the thought that every Jew continues to crucify the Messiah.”⁸ Aksakov likewise expressed his negative opinion regarding the granting of rights of citizenship to Jews, based on Christian reasons, in his article in the Russian newspaper *Den’* (Day) in 1864. Ettinger summarizes Aksakov’s views as “He is permeated with lack of trust in the Jew, and particularly in the Enlightened Jew.”⁹

Ettinger also cites Aksakov’s diary entry from June 1881, where he sympathetically commented on the development of antisemitic movement in Germany that: “It is a sign of the times, indicating the awakening of consciousness, of the public consciousness.” Aksakov also hopefully wrote that: “The Western European Christian world may be expected in the future to engage in a life-and-death struggle with Judaism, which seeks to replace the Christian idea . . . with a Semitic, anti-Christian idea.”¹⁰

In his book *The History of the Jewish People in Modern Times*, Ettinger discusses the history of the Jews in Russia, and mentions the worsening of the attitude towards Jews that occurred among several groups within the Russian public. Ettinger notes the role played by the propaganda of the Slavophile circles in this connection, and the increasingly hostile attitude towards the Jews in Russia during the 1870s: “The main cause was the spread of Slavophile ideas among the Russian public—ideals which emphasized the uniqueness of Russia, whose entire spirit was supposedly opposed to that of the West, blaming the Jews for spreading that destructive spirit and exploiting the principle population.”¹¹ Ettinger summarizes in general terms the position of the Jewish Maskilim in Russia in the struggle between “Slavophiles” and “Westernizers,” stating that from the 1860s onwards the Jews began to increasingly support the approach of Westernization in every respect.¹²

7 Cited *ibid.*, 194.

8 *Ibid.*, 224.

9 *Ibid.*, 215–216.

10 *Ibid.*

11 Shemuel Ettinger, *Toldot am Yisrael*, vol. 3: *Toldot Yisrael be-et he-chadasha* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1969), 107–108.

12 Shemuel Ettinger, *Toldot am Yisrael me-mahafekhot 1848 ad le-hakamat medinat Yisrael* (Jerusalem: Akademon, 1966).

Among the reasons for the reserved and even hostile position of the Slavophiles towards the Jewish problem in Russia, Ettinger notes the alien nature of the Jews within the Russian environment and the fears of the Slavophiles that the Jews were disseminating alien culture within Russia.¹³ Ettinger writes that the Slavophiles, and in particular Ivan Aksakov, “saw the Jews [as] a hostile and dangerous force. In their mind, the Jews were a destructive and exploitative anti-Christian element, carrying values that were alien to the spirit of the Slavic peoples and to the Russian Orthodox religion. A cohesive body that wished to dominate others.” According to the Slavophiles, the Jews exerted a destructive influence on the peoples among whom they lived.¹⁴ Ettinger summarizes by stating that the attitude of the Slavophiles towards the Jews was fundamentally antisemitic.¹⁵

2.3. Alienation between the Russians and the Jews after the Pogroms of the 1880s

The pogroms of the 1880s in Russia brought about changes in the attitude of the Jewish public and led to the formulation of a nationalist ideology within the circles of the Jewish intelligentsia as they began to feel their alienation towards the hostile non-Jewish environment. This alienation was mutual. Within Russian society, the question of what was referred to as Jewish exploitation of the Russian society within the economic area now occupied an important place. This view was supported not only by supporters of the Slavophile trends, but even among liberal and pro-Western groups within Russia.

In his fundamental monograph on the activity of Y. L. Gordon,¹⁶ Michael Stanislawski, one of the main scholars of the history of Jews in Eastern Europe, presents a picture of Gordon in this period as attempting to renew the ideals of the Enlightenment movement, which he supported from the very beginning of his work, and to join them with nationalism. This trend is particularly striking in the last decade of Gordon's work, albeit he took a certain exception to the activities of Chovevei Zion (the early Russian Proto-Zionist movement).

Alongside Gordon's approach to the subject of nationalism, which was one of the most heated subjects within the public discourse in Russia during

13 Idem, *Bein Polin le-Rusia* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1994), 317, 384.

14 Ibid., 425.

15 Ibid., 438.

16 Michael Stanislawski, *For Whom do I Toil; Judah Leib Gordon and the Crisis of Russian Jewry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

that period, Peretz Smolenskin's views regarding this subject are also very important. In his critical writings, Smolenskin proposed a nationalism fueled by the recognition of the national past and the historical consciousness of the Jewish people. In light of the geographical split among the Jewish communities during the period of the exile, he saw need to emphasize the great importance of national consciousness that could serve as a substitute for territorial and political factors, which had been denied to the Jews during the period of their exile among the other nations.¹⁷ Smolenskin also drew parallels between the Jews and the European nations, especially the national minorities within the framework of the Austro-Hungarian and the Russian Empires who were also struggling for national independence. In particular, Smolenskin related to the efforts of the Polish people to receive their national autonomy, as expressed in the Polish rebellion, first in 1831, and particularly the second time, in 1863—both of which failed. Smolenskin celebrated the victories in the struggles of the small nations for independence and noted that these rebellions were an example of the awakening of the national idea, which could be imitated by the Jewish communities in Europe—especially since the Jews were, in his opinion, superior to other nations in terms of their cultural and historical heritage.¹⁸

17 Peretz Ben-Moshe Smolenskin, "Am Olam," in his *Ma'amarim* (Jerusalem: Keren Smolenskin, 1925), vol. 1, 1–162, particularly 16–38, 55–68, 127–162.

18 Peretz Ben-Moshe Smolenskin, "Et Lata'at," in his *Ma'amarim* (Jerusalem: Keren Smolenskin, 1925), vol. 2, 1–290, particularly 9ff.

Chapter 3: A Comparison of the Views of Y. L. Gordon and Russian Thinkers

3.1. Y. L. Gordon as a Leading Figure of the Haskalah and His National Views

When discussing the formation of Jewish national consciousness, one should note in particular the approach of Yehuda Leib Gordon, one of the most prominent Jewish Maskilim. In what follows below, I shall compare Gordon's views regarding national identity¹ with those of Aleksei Khomiakov,² a central representative of the Russian Slavophile movement.³

Gordon's nationalist doctrine mainly called for the cultivation of national feeling among the Jewish public, but his attitude toward the national question was complicated and ambivalent.⁴ In this chapter I take particular note of Gordon's ideas about Jewish national identity, which are parallel to those known in Russian thought. A considerable resemblance may be seen between statements of Russian thinkers, such as Aleksei Khomiakov, Yuri Samarin, Konstantin Aksakov, and, with some reservations, Peter Chaadayev,⁵ and Jewish thinkers, such as Yehudah Leib Gordon and Peretz Smolenskin, dealing with national revival of their peoples.

Yehudah Leib Gordon made an extraordinary contribution in terms of the weight and power of the subject of Jewish nationalistic doctrine, expressed

-
- 1 Yehudah Leib Gordon (1830–1892) was among the most important Hebrew poets and thinkers of the Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment). Gordon took a leading part in the modern revival of the Hebrew language and culture.
 - 2 Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov (1804–1860) was a Russian thinker and one of the leaders of the Slavophile movement. He was engaged primarily in journalism as well as poetry, and was also involved in philosophical and theological discussions.
 - 3 About Aleksei Khomiakov's worldview see "Slavianofil'stvo," in *Slovar' filosofskikh terminov*, ed. V. G. Kuznetsov (Moscow: Infra-M, 2007), 511–513.
 - 4 Hillel Barzel, "Yehudah Leib Gordon: Yahadut ve-hitbolelut," in *Maskil be-et ha-zot—Sefer yovel le-Moshe Pelli, ma'amarim be-Haskalah, sifrut yivrit ve-limudei yahadut*, ed. Zeev Gerber, Lev Khakak, and Shemuel Katz (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad, 2017), 40–65.
 - 5 On the complex relationship between the philosophy of Chaadayev and the Slavophiles see S. D. Gurevich-Lishchiner, *P. Ia. Chaadaev v kul'ture dvukh vekov* (St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriia, 2006), 40–49, 213–220.

first and foremost in his Hebrew articles and essays. His first publications on the uniqueness of the Jewish nation appeared in the middle of the 1860s. In the beginning of his literary path in 1866, Gordon saw Russian Jewry, like the citizens of Russia as a whole, as an integral part of the enlightened Europe.⁶ During this period he explicitly supported the path of the Western European Jews, who had the wisdom to integrate themselves within the life of the countries where they lived, and advocated drawing close to the cultures of the surrounding countries. He presented the European culture as the ideal, and called upon the Jews of Russia to follow the example of their Western brethren.

Gordon, who was the leading figure in Russian Haskalah at the end of the 1870s, took a clearly pro-Western line. A characteristic expression of his position may be found in the debate conducted in 1873 on the pages of the Russian paper *The Voice* (Golos) between Gordon and Kireyevsky, the editor of the paper.⁷ Gordon supported the process of drawing Jews close to Russian culture, even though he continued to preach on behalf of the preservation of Jewish identity and its historic heritage.⁸ He hoped, by the nature of things, that his words would bear fruit and be accepted, primarily among the liberal camp of the Russian Jewish public, which became progressively stronger during those days, particularly against the background of the ugly atmosphere of antisemitic manifestations in Russia at the beginning of the 1880s.

3.2. "A Flask of Feuilletons," by Y. L. Gordon

In Gordon's critical writings, and particularly in the series "A Flask of Feuilletons,"⁹ which he published during the years 1880–1887 in the paper *Ha-Melitz* (Advocate), his stance on the various aspects of the national problems of the Jewish people, in Western Europe and especially in Russia, is clearly reflected.¹⁰ He explains two aspects of his position—his positive approach to the nationalist slogans of the Chibbat Zion movement, which he supported, on the one hand; and his natural relationship to general European culture, on the other, a combination that he saw as being without contradiction.

6 Yehudah Leib Gordon, "Hakitzah Ami," in his *Ktavav* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1959–1960), vol. 1, 17.

7 Kireevskii, *Kritika i estetika*, 288.

8 Stanislawski, *For Whom do I Toil*, 115–116.

9 Yehudah Leib Gordon, "Tezlochit shel plaiton," in his *Ktavav* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1959–1960), vol. 2, 183–243, 349–351.

10 Articles and other works cited below from *Ha-Melitz* are anthologized in Gordon's collected works (see bibliography). References to these passages are noted according to that edition.

In his poem "I Sleep and My Heart is Awake," Gordon's national consciousness is expressed in his attitude to the manifestations of antisemitism in Germany, even before the outbreak of the 1880s pogroms in Russia.¹¹ He nevertheless notes the substantive distinction between the hostile position of the Catholic Church towards the Jewish people—especially in the Middle Ages—and the more moderate attitude of the Russian Orthodox church in Russia.

In several articles which he published in *Ha-Melitz*, Gordon relates to this distinction in the context of a fierce debate that he conducted with the spokesmen of antisemitism in France, Germany, and Russia, who in his opinion made up false accusations and directed hostile words against the Jewish people and its spiritual heritage. Gordon is deeply worried about the problems of its cultural and spiritual existence in the present and in the future, alongside his thoughts concerning the dangers to the physical existence of the Jewish people. In one of his feuilletons from 1881, he expresses his concern about the assimilation of the Jews of Western Europe.¹² Gordon's concern over the spread of assimilation was not only directed toward the Jews of Western Europe, but he also found troubling signs of this problem among the Jews of Russia as well. His concern was twofold—both for the continued physical existence of Russian Jewry in an age of antisemitism and persecution, and for the people's spiritual existence.¹³

In a controversy between himself and Chovevei Zion on Russia, Gordon responded in a literary manner, in an imaginative genre, in "A Flask of Feuilletons" (1886). The members of the Zionist movement accused him of estrangement from the national idea and from plan to settle in the Land of Israel, and he attempted to prove that natural national feelings towards the Jewish people indeed pulsed in his heart. During the course of this moving explanation, placed in an imaginary narrative framework in "A Flask of Feuilletons," he refers to what was being written in the Russian magazines of his day, where a debate was conducted about the meaning of Russian national identity. In his humorous feuilletonic manner, he lists the essential differences between the "Westernizers" and the Slavophiles, who call to turn their back upon the West and to enclose themselves within the narrow circle of the Russian cultural heritage alone.¹⁴

11 Yehudah Leib Gordon, "Ani yeshena ve-libbi er," in his *Ktavav* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1959–1960), vol. 2, 246.

12 Gordon, "Tezlochit shel plaiton," 198–199.

13 Yehudah Leib Gordon, "Ha-Evke?," in his *Ktavav* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1959–1960), 259.

14 Klausner describes in great detail the differences between Chovevei Zion and Y. L. Gordon during the 1880s. He states definitively that: "Gordon, as a poet with intense feeling and as a product of the Romantic period . . . found it impossible not to dream of the return to Zion. When this idea began to awaken . . . in the form of a major movement within

Gordon presents the arguments and outlooks of each of these streams in Russian society. Regarding the Westernizers, he says: "One group is of the opinion of those whose face is turned toward the West, who rely upon the reformist tradition of Peter the Great."¹⁵ The position of the second group, who in his eyes "are great zealots"—he refrains from referring to them as Slavophiles—is presented by Gordon in the following way: "First and foremost we are Russians, and all the old customs, even the most trivial ones, are holy to us. European enlightenment is nothing more than a flash of light that blinds the eyes; therefore let us return to Old Russia as it was before the reign of Peter the First."¹⁶ It should be noted that Gordon mocks the extremists in this group, who are preoccupied with trivialities and wish to manifest their nationalism, for example, through the choice of a particular kind of food. In addressing the Jewish nationalist camp, as represented by Chovevei Zion, Gordon also notes the antisemitic tendency of the Slavophile camp in Russian society: "Are they not those who call out, 'Get out, dirty [Jew],' and who bring upon us all kinds of suffering and bad things."¹⁷

Gordon also discusses in "A Flask of Feuilletons" the problem of a suitable combination between the ideal of Haskalah and that of Jewish nationalism. He explains that European culture and the ideals of the Haskalah do not contradict one another.¹⁸

3.3. The Jewish National Question in Y. L. Gordon's View

The national question occupied an important place for many people in Gordon's milieu—both Jewish and Russian—as reflected in his Hebrew writings. Among the Jewish public, the national question was discussed in two ways: in a theoretical manner, as among the Maskilim; and in a more practical manner—such as that formulated by Chovevei Zion. Gordon's words express his own moderate and balanced approach to the subject of Jewish nationality. According to his nationalist doctrine, one must cultivate national feeling among the Jewish public, and exercise special caution when dealing with planning practical steps, such as settlement in the Land of Israel.

Jewry, it was impossible that he not be drawn to it." See Klausner, *Ha-historia shel ha-sifrut ha-yivrit*, vol. 6, 405.

15 Gordon, "Tezlochit shel plaiton," 216.

16 Ibid.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid., 222.

Gordon suggests various ways of strengthening the Jewish national feeling, the most important of which is insistence upon preservation of the Hebrew language and Hebrew literature and their cultivation as a national asset. Of course, any other cultural asset that may help to revive Jewish national feeling is also worthy of preserving and cultivating. Gordon finds this imperative very important as, in his opinion, the national feeling is not at all developed among Jews, unlike with other nations. This lack of the national feeling among Jews derives, on the one hand, from the fact of their exile; and, on the other hand, from the oppressive rule of the Orthodox rabbis, whose tendency is to uproot any feeling apart from the religious one from the heart of the Jew.

3.4. Parallels between the National Ideas of Haskalah and Those of the Nationalist Movements in Russia

We shall examine below whether there was a real relationship between the “nationalist atmosphere” in Russia and Eastern Europe as described above in its various forms and the emergence of national values in the Jewish world during that same period—the period of the Haskalah and Chibbat Zion—referring primarily to the radical fraction within the Haskalah in the second half of the nineteenth century. One might also formulate this question in a different manner: are the beliefs and ideas of the Haskalah part of the general “nationalist atmosphere” that predominated in Russia and Eastern Europe at that time?

In order to further investigate this question, I shall examine below the views of Gordon, as well as a few other explicit representatives of the Haskalah, and in particular their attitude toward the subject of Jewish national identity. Gordon's relation to Russian literature, and particularly to the various expressions of Russian journalism in the nineteenth century, have not been sufficiently studied to date. There are, it is true, a few isolated studies on the influence of Russian poetry on Gordon's creativity, indicative of common motifs and genres—but these are only a beginning.¹⁹ It has also been noted that, in the spirit of the definition of the Russian critic Belinsky, Gordon realizes the double goal of a national poet—the creation of aesthetic values that are also intended to serve his people.²⁰ However, when one turns to the realm of thought and to the national principles that served as the basis for Gordon's belletristic and journalistic activity, the connection between his own spiritual world and that of other thinkers remains to be studied. To date, no attempt has

19 Yaakov Ben-Yeshurun (Kitaikesher), *Ha-shira ha-rusit ve-hashpa'ata al ha-shira ha-yivrit ha-chadasha* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1955), 89–103.

20 Uzi Shavit, *Shira ve-ideo'ologia* (Tel Aviv: Ha-kibbutz ha-meuchad and Keter, 1987), 118.

been made regarding his thought to compare his writings to Russian thought and journalism of the nineteenth century.

In what follows, I shall attempt to make such a comparison. I will take note of those lines of thought in Gordon's approach to Jewish national identity, as expressed in his belletristic and critical works published in the 1860s and thereafter, that are parallel to lines known in Russian thought already in the 1850s, especially within the Slavophile movement and its offshoots, as represented in the writings of Khomiakov. Notwithstanding the substantive differences between Gordon's spiritual world and the outlook and struggles of the Slavophiles concerning the destiny of the Russian people and its status among European peoples, there are in fact parallels and common points where the two worlds meet.

First of all, one needs to emphasize the substantial opposition between the world of Gordon, the Haskalah intellectual who sought to convey to the Jewish world the values of Western European culture, and that of the Slavophiles, who specifically sought to remove themselves from the influence of Western culture and to close themselves off within the world of Russian values. Nevertheless, as against this opposition, the ideological similarity between them seems to be even more significant. The comparison between their ideas definitely indicates a shared phenomenon—namely, the growing interest in the national question and the quest for the essence of nationality. Gordon's writings on these subjects show parallels to various fractions of Russian Slavophile thought.

3.5. The Uniqueness of the Russian People and of the Jewish People: Parallel Concepts

The orientation of the Slavophiles was admittedly directed inwards, towards the Russian people, while the advocates of Jewish Haskalah specifically proposed openness towards the outside worlds of Russia and Europe. But notwithstanding these differences, there are common points in the approach of both these groups to the idea of the nation.

The first point on which Gordon and Khomiakov agreed was understanding of nation as an entity independent of, and separate from, religion, despite its closeness to the religious establishment (Jewish, in the case of Gordon; Russian Orthodox, in that of Khomiakov). For both of them, the nation is a basic, sublime value, rooted deeply within the soul of the people and its way of life. It is an object of people's pride, for which reason it ought to be preserved, cultivated, and protected from powerful foreign influences that upset its balance. True, there are positive foreign influences that ought to be absorbed within the national culture, but these must be selected judiciously, so as not

to bring about the destruction of the national culture in their wake. Uncritical openness may destroy the foundations of the nation and the particular character of the people—whether Jewish or Russian.

This principled position, combining an explicitly nationalist stance with cautious openness to other cultures, appears more than once in the writings of Gordon²¹ as well as Khomiakov.²² They both believed that the path to achieving their goal was through preserving the national language, insisting upon national customs, and in loyalty to national cultural values and thought, characteristic of one or another people only. This outlook, common to Khomiakov and Gordon, particularly stands out in Gordon's Russian-language writings, such as the series of his articles titled "Review of Jewish Literature and Journal Essays" published in *Voskhod* (Dawn) journal in 1881–1882.²³ For example, he criticizes the approach, very widespread in his day, of bringing Jews close to the world of the Russians. In his view, this approach is mechanical, hasty, and simplistic, and it will lead to the negation of the national uniqueness of the Jews, and thereby miss its goal. In his opinion, Jews must be brought into the world of Russian culture in a moderate way, while preserving and cultivating their own cultural world:

they began . . . to draw the Jews close and to turn them into Russians. But from the outset they did not render an accounting of the significance of this process and in exactly what is expressed the transformation of Jews into Russians. . . . It may be accomplished in half an hour on the shores of some river, like the example of St. Vladimir²⁴ with the inhabitants from Novgorod.²⁵

Using sarcasm and bitter humor, Gordon draws a comparison between the behavior of the officials of the Russian government and the act of St. Vladimir, who forcibly made the inhabitants of Novgorod to immerse themselves in the

21 Yehudah Leib Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet. Ma'amarav shel Y. L. Gordon be-Voschod ba shanim 1881–1882*, trans., ed., and intro. Rina Lapidus (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 2012), 112–113, 59, 202–203.

22 Aleksei Khomiakov, "Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii," in his *Izbrannye sochineniia*, ed. and intro. N. S. Arsen'ev (New York: Chekhov Publishers, 1955), 15, 80–82.

23 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 138.

24 Vladimir the Saint, or the Great (958–1015) was a prince of Novgorod. Originally a Slavic pagan, he converted to Christianity in 988 and Christianized the Kievan Rus, forcibly baptizing the inhabitants of the city of Novgorod.

25 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 138.

waters of the nearby river—thereby introducing Christianity into Russia, which had until then been a pagan nation.

Also identical are Gordon and Khomiakov's views regarding the national uniqueness of every people. Both of them describe a nation as closed-off and impenetrable to anyone who is not its member. This, according to Gordon, is the reason for the numerous misunderstandings in the relations between one nation and another, even when each one intends to do right with the other. In his article "A Survey of Jewish Literature and Press," Gordon emphasizes the national uniqueness of the Jewish people, which separates it from the peoples in its environment:

This is the first among all the cultured peoples of the earth to have a unique form of education; the cultural continuity of this people also needs to be developed in accordance with its uniqueness. . . . Religion was always in the center of Jewish being . . . and it needs to be preserved and developed if we wish this spirit to continue to pulsate.²⁶

Indeed, Gordon saw nation as distinct from religion. However, in his opinion, the Jewish religion can't be completely abolished by the Jewish people. One therefore must insist upon, and preserve, the main elements of the religion as a basis characteristic of the Jewish nation.

Gordon repeatedly develops the idea of the uniqueness of the Jewish people and the need to preserve and cultivate it. Another important element of the Jewish national specificity is their language: in an article published in the same year, Gordon states: "The path of Hebrew is like that of the Jews."²⁷

Views in a similar spirit are expressed in the writings of the outstanding figure of the Slavophile movement, Khomiakov, who preceded Gordon. In his article "The View of Strangers about Russia," Khomiakov,²⁸ like Gordon, explains why one needs to be insistent and cautious about absorbing foreign influences. In his opinion, the world of Western culture is very distant from that of Russia, and it is not at all fitting for one to be too open to it or to copy things from it in a mechanical way, without careful and precise selection. Excessive openness will not help Russia, but may well harm it. In his article "To the Serbs—A Letter from Moscow," he calls upon other Slavic peoples to preserve and cultivate their own unique national tradition, which is very different from the tradition of the

26 Ibid., 180.

27 Ibid., 60–61.

28 Khomiakov, "Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii," 80–86.

peoples of the West: "You must therefore learn from the Western peoples, this is a necessary thing. Nevertheless, you must not imitate them, do not place your trust in them, as we have been accustomed to do in our blindness. May God protect you from such a misfortune. . . . Do not adopt foreign customs. . . ." ²⁹

In the same spirit he goes on to note that the Slavic peoples must display an attitude of combined "respect and suspicion" towards the achievements of the West. While these achievements are far from inconsiderable, it is not at all clear whether they are good or beneficial to the Slavic peoples: "The Western kind of enlightenment is a heavy burden for us. . . . Under this heavy burden are buried the seeds of true enlightenment . . . suitable to the Slavic peoples, the seeds of the good, the seeds of true life." ³⁰

In the writings of other Russian Slavophiles, such as Venevitinov and Belinsky, ³¹ one finds similar ideas concerning the uniqueness of the Russian people and the need to preserve and cultivate its cultural uniqueness.

In fact, the uniqueness of the Russian people and the inability of other nations to understand their national spirit were emphasized in the writings of many Russian thinkers, including those who were opposed to the Slavophiles. An important example is Peter Chaadayev (1794–1856). ³² Chaadayev was not a Slavophile, but belonged to the opposing group, the Westernizers. And yet, in his first philosophical letter, written on December 1, 1829, Chaadayev expresses the idea that the Russian people is unlike all other peoples (see also below).

29 See Aleksei Khomiakov, "K serbam. Poslanie iz Moskvy," in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova*, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Universitetskaya tipografiya na Strastnom bul'vare, 1886–1906), 189, and cf. 90, 195, 196, 206.

30 Aleksei Khomiakov, "Mnenie russkikh ob inostrantsakh," in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova*, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Universitetskaya tipografiya na Strastnom bul'vare, 1886–1906), 113; and cf. also *ibid.*, 135.

31 Venevitinov, *Stikhotvoreniia. Proza*, 129.

32 Petr Yakovlevich Chaadayev (1794–1856) was an eminent Russian philosopher, who wrote eight "Philosophical Letters" about the Russian condition between 1826 and 1831. The main thesis of this work was that Russia lagged behind progressive Western countries. The letters included criticism of Russia's intellectual isolation and social backwardness. See V. Iu. Proskurina, "O zhizni i myshlenii P. Ia. Chaadaeva," introduction to P. Ia. Chaadaev, *Izbrannye sochineniia i pis'ma* (Moscow: Pravda, 1991), 3–20. See also A. A. Ermichov and A. A. Zlatopol'skaia, "P. Ia. Chaadaev v russkoi mysli. Opyt istoriografii," introduction to P. Ia. Chaadaev: *PRO ET CONTRA. Lichnost' i tvorchestvo Petra Chaadaeva v otsenke russkikh myslitelei i issledovatelei*, ed. D. K. Burlak (St. Petersburg: Russkii khristianskii gumanitarnyi institut, 1998), 7–40. The "Philosophical Letters" by Chaadayev have been translated into many languages, for example, into German: Peter Chaadayev, "Philosophischen Briefe," trans. Heinrich Falk, in Heinrich Falk, *Das Weltbild Peter J. Tschaadajews nach seinen acht "Philosophischen Briefen"* (Munich: Isar Verlag, 1954), 85–128. Two English translations are listed in the bibliography.

In his opinion, the Russian people are a unique nation, whom the members of the other nations do not understand. However, Chaadayev asserts that the uniqueness of the Russian nation is negative, and it is destined to serve as a bad example to the other peoples of Europe, showing them how bad their destiny will be if they conduct themselves according to irrational, esoteric, or religious criteria, as the Russian people does. The European nations do not understand the negative uniqueness of the Russian people, but relate to it as if it were one of the peoples of Europe, thereby causing lack of understanding among the nations.

3.6. The Soul of the Nation Is Concealed and Unknowable to Foreigners

Both Gordon and Khomiakov, each in their respective national circle, claimed that their nations were unique and that the essence of their people was concealed and impermeable to outsiders. A foreigner cannot understand the source of the soul of our people (“us”)—whether the Jewish people, in Gordon’s writings; or that of the Russian people, in that of Khomiakov. According to both, a profound gap exists between their nation and those that surround them—for which reason members of their own nation are the object of unseemly attitudes on the part of others. These harsh insults and attacks are rooted in lack of understanding on the part of the foreign nations regarding a nation whose nature is unique unto itself, and therefore different from them.

Gordon and Khomiakov, each in his own way, say what they do from the point of view of a sensitive person who identifies completely with his own injured nation. Each of them complains of the suffering that his people is forced to undergo at the hands of other nations as a result of these misunderstandings. Their standpoint is nationalist and one-dimensional, and their words, marked by anger, pain, and bitterness, reflect their turbulent emotions when they speak on behalf of their humiliated people. Thus, Khomiakov speaks primarily of the contempt expressed in the humiliating attitude towards the Russian people on the part of other nations, while Gordon emphasizes the vulgarity and coarseness which is suffered by the Jews in Russia. Parallel to this, Gordon states that, in order to understand the uniqueness of the Jewish people, one needs first of all to study the sources of its religion, history and culture: “in the history of the Jewish people, its religious history and political history are inseparably interwoven with one another.”³³

Even before the outbreak of the pogroms in the Ukraine (1882), during a period that was considered an era of liberalism and great hopes, Gordon complained about “the persecutions and misfortunes suffered by the Jews due

33 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 159–161.

to the arbitrariness of the estate owners and the government.”³⁴ His complaints grew during the pogroms in the spring of 1882, which reinforced his adoption of a one-dimensional and emotional nationalist approach that became even stronger as the pogroms continued. During this period he also speaks of the gaps in the areas of thought, culture, and tradition.³⁵

Khomiakov, prior to him, said things in a similar spirit. In his article “The Opinion of Strangers about Russia,” he writes:

[There is a] clear awareness of the nations of the West of the existence of a deep gap between the cultural and social roots of Russia and the cultural and social roots of Western Europe. . . . Therefore we should not expect from them love and brotherhood, but we should at least have been able to expect them to show us respect. . . . Unfortunately, this too we have not yet received.³⁶

Further on, he says: “it is so painful to encounter enmity in a place where we had expected to find expressions of feelings of friendship and solidarity of peoples.”³⁷ Opinions and approaches of this sort were quite accepted and widespread among other Slavophiles. S. Shevyrev, for example, expressed himself in a similar spirit.³⁸ In fact, such moods were widespread during that period among most of the circles of thinkers in Russia, in addition to Slavophiles.

While those opinions and approaches were common to Gordon and Khomiakov, we ought by rights to reemphasize the differences between them. Their views concerning the uniqueness of the nation and of misunderstandings towards it on the part of foreign nations are identical, but the reasons for the misunderstandings between the peoples are different. The misunderstanding of the Russian people by foreigners derives, according to Khomiakov’s school of Slavophiles, from the mystical nature of the authentic Russian soul, which is impossible to attain in an intellectual or rational way, but only in an experiential religious manner. By contrast, Gordon’s approach to the concept of the Jewish nation is more rational and sober. According to Gordon, misunderstandings between Jews and the Russian people are rooted in objective

34 Ibid., 193.

35 Ibid., 161ff.

36 Khomiakov, “Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii,” 80–81.

37 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 15.

38 A. M. Peskov, “U istokov russkogo filosofstvovaniia: Russkaia ideia S. P. Shevyreva,” *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 7 (1994): 128–129.

cultural gaps between them. The lack of tolerance towards Jews on the part of Russian government officials, their unwillingness to understand their spirit, their exaggerated demands and expectations for their immediate realization—all these continued to poison the atmosphere between the Russian regime and the Jewish community. Moreover, the elementary ignorance on the part of the ordinary Russian people regarding everything relating to Jews and Judaism added their share to the gap between the two nations.

3.7. The National Pride That Our People Feel Due to Their Spiritual Power and Moral Strength

The most important and significant element regarding the subject of nationhood is the pride of each people in “our” spiritual and ethical values. Both Khomiakov and Gordon see their own nation as unique, bearing an extraordinary spiritual wealth and ethical strength, an ancient and original people, a people of strength by virtue of its difficult history. Gordon writes:

This is the first people among all the cultured peoples of the earth that has a unique form of education; the cultural continuity of this people also needs to be developed in accordance with its uniqueness. . . . Religion was always in the center of Jewish being. . . . This is the rock from which is hewn the national spirit of the Jewish people, and it needs to be preserved and developed if we wish this spirit to continue to pulsate.³⁹

Gordon goes on to say:

While in the very long history of the Jewish people there have been attempts made to reject Hebrew and exchange it for another language, these attempts have failed and their results were unfortunate. . . . No trace or remnant of the Hellenizers remains in the world.⁴⁰ . . . The Jews, uprooted from the soil from which they grew and banished from their borders, gain a vital spirit from their spiritual life. So too Hebrew, which has also been uprooted from the soil on which it blossomed and uprooted from the lips of its people, continues despite everything

39 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 179–180.

40 Ibid.

to exist in spirit, by virtue of the people which sustained it and which miraculously preserved it.⁴¹

Khomiakov, prior to him, wrote in a similar spirit. In his article “The View of Foreigners about Russians,” he writes:

The jealousy of other nations has two reasons. The first is that the nations of the West are clearly aware of the existence of a deep gap between the cultural and social roots of Russia and the cultural and social roots of Western Europe. The second reason is the frustration of the Western peoples upon confronting the tremendous power by virtue of which we have attained our place among the nations of the West. . . . They cannot overcome us . . . Therefore we should not expect from them love and brotherhood, but we should at least have been able to expect them to show us respect. . . . Unfortunately, this too we have not yet received.⁴²

It is clear that, in Khomiakov’s eyes, the Russian people is the most ancient, authentic, praiseworthy and superior of all the peoples of Europe. The Russian people has a glorious history of struggle, filled with pride of independence, high ethical values, and brilliant intellectual entertainments.

For both Khomiakov and Gordon the national pride is particularly strengthened against the background of their seeking ways for an independent definition of nationalism and the need to locate differences between the author’s own people and other nations, which that are meant to emphasize the superiority of the author’s people. National pride serves as a source of inspiration and encouragement of the author and of other members of his people, and it is essential for the national self-definition of the people.

3.8. Foreigners—a Factor Causing Lack of Understanding between Peoples

To a large extent, Gordon and Khomiakov imposed the responsibility for the misunderstanding between their people and the surrounding nations upon persons who spread unreliable impressions from their visits to other countries. Khomiakov thinks that the lack of understanding between the Russian people and the European peoples has its source in distorted information received from

41 Ibid., 60–61.

42 Khomiakov, “Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii,” 80–81.

European tourists upon their return from visits in Russia. Similarly, Gordon places a good deal of the responsibility for the lack of understanding between Jews and Russians upon persons of authority within the Russian public whose impressions and reports from their visits in the Jewish community were distorted.

Various kinds of foreign visitors, upon returning to their country or their community, took care, in their words, to disseminate locally their negative impressions of Jewish or Russian society, which do not correspond to reality—acts entailing an element of deliberate wickedness. In these subjective descriptions, the Russians (according to Khomiakov) or the Jews (in Gordon's writings) are depicted as wild, barbaric people, esoteric and strange specimens—descriptions that lead to astonishment and repulsion from the surrounding communities.

Both thinkers were convinced that these foreign visitors were filled with prejudices even before their visits, so that their words included an element of vicious intention from the outset—something that would obviate any chance of creating a favorable impression, as these foreigners were only interested in finding confirmation and evidence of their negative preconceptions. And indeed, both Khomiakov and Gordon entirely reject the opinions of these critics, which do not contain the slightest element of truth.

Both Gordon and Khomiakov express their views in a very emotional style, and one can strongly feel their deep personal involvement. Each of them adopted a stance of defensiveness, while simultaneously resenting and rejecting the very need to defend themselves against such accusations, which to their eyes are totally refuted from the outset. I shall cite below several examples of this phenomenon in the writings of Gordon and Khomiakov, who represent the Haskalah and the Slavophile movement, respectively.

Gordon describes Peter the Great's opinion on the Jews as follows: "Peter himself, even though he was enlightened and clever, was filled with prejudices regarding the Jews. . . . Peter himself and his close advisors did not have any realistic picture of who the Jews are of their nature."⁴³ Further on, Gordon describes the impressions of one of Peter the Great's senior advisors from his visit to a community of Dutch Jews:

I visited a person who was a collector . . . and saw in his collection the thirty silver coins, for which Judas Iscariot sold Jesus. The weight of these silver coins was the equivalent of eight Russian kopecks (!) . . . With my own eyes I saw the stone from which Moses drew the water in the desert.⁴⁴

43 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 321.

44 Ibid., 322.

Gordon criticizes the poor judgment of the royal advisor: "This man, who was intelligent and belonged to the very highest circles, relates to these 'ethnological discoveries' in a totally childish and naive way."⁴⁵ He adds with sadness: "To this day there has not taken shape any kind of *modus vivendi* between Russians and the Jews . . . for which reason the Russians are unable to know the Jews well."⁴⁶

Khomiakov also discusses the misunderstandings and distorted perceptions that are widely found among foreigners in everything relating to Russia and its inhabitants. In his article "The View of Foreigners about Russians," he complains that, "It is strange that Russia alone preserves the doubtful 'privilege' to arouse the worst feelings in the European hearts."⁴⁷ He attributes this phenomenon to the limited perceptions of these travelers:

More than once we are "privileged" by the visits of travelers who later on bring to Europe misinformation about us, about Russia. . . . Where did this person spend all his time during his visit to us? Almost certainly he spent the entire time within some narrow circle of foreigners like himself. . . . Almost none of those European writers knew at all the Russian language . . . he almost certainly evaluates them [events which he witnessed] differently than would the Russian people themselves do.⁴⁸

He explains in a detailed way that these travelers were already bound to preconceptions when they arrived in Russia, and their fanatic attachment to these prejudgments prevented them from really knowing the Russians or clarifying the truth about Russia:

In certain senses one can say that the traveler who conducts a journey is corrupt and unfit in comparison to the home resident. His perception is one sided . . . he looks at the life of another people from the side—but he is alien to it and ignores it; he separates himself off and refuses to gain true knowledge of the people that he is examining.⁴⁹

45 Ibid., 322–323.

46 Ibid., 323.

47 Khomiakov, "Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii," 80.

48 Ibid., 81.

49 Ibid., 82; and cf. in this spirit also *ibid.*, 84.

Khomiakov concludes on a note of sadness: “I am completely convinced that Russia was and remains in their eyes [of educated people of other countries] to this very day terra incognita.”⁵⁰

One must nevertheless note that, alongside these negative manifestations of the influence of foreign visitors, Khomiakov also cites the positive expressions of those few foreign travelers who did not speak ill of Russia, and were even positively impressed by it and gave public expression of this in publications in their own countries.⁵¹ But these were very few in number, unique and isolated individuals, who were unsuccessful in countering the influence of the critics who caused damage to the good name of Russia in the Western world.

3.9. Other Nations’ Lack of Understanding Towards Us Leads, in the Final Analysis, to Animosity

Khomiakov observes that members of other nations relate to “us”—that is, to the Russian people—with reservation and hostility. The attitude towards the Russians on the part of other nations is not objective, honest, or positive attitude, as the Russians would like to see, but rather “an attitude of contempt and mockery, mixed with shame and fear.”⁵² This negative attitude is supported by lack of knowledge concerning Russians, beginning with basic ignorance of the Russian culture and way of life. Foreigners are aware of the gap between Russia and the West in all aspects of spirit, religion, and culture, and they relate to Russia with an unwillingness to understand it and its ways, preferring to preserve an attitude of superiority.⁵³ The hostility of members of other nations “towards us,” the Russians, is a result of their intellectual limitations, as they are unable to absorb new things or to understand them. Moreover, in truth, these foreigners are not really interested in understanding us, but tend to laugh at us without troubling to understand.

Gordon also complains about the contemptuous attitude of members of other peoples towards the Jews. His Russian-language articles, which were published in the journal *Voskhod*, are filled with expressions of pain and sorrow for this feeling. Matters become even more severe after the pogroms of 1881–1882. In his Hebrew writings there likewise appear expressions of complaint

50 Aleksei Khomiakov, “Neskol’ko slov pravoslavnogo khristianina o zapadnykh veroispovedaniiakh,” in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova*, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia na Strastnom bul’vare, 1886–1906), 231–232.

51 Khomiakov, “Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii,” 102.

52 Ibid., 80.

53 Ibid., 80–81.

regarding the contemptuous attitude of the Russians towards the Jews; he writes of the image of the Jew in the eyes of the Russians: "and we were a shame among the nations, mockery and ridicule to our environment."⁵⁴

However, one could argue that the hostile attitude towards the Jews was a known historical fact, something that already found clear expression in the pogroms of 1881. Therefore, Gordon's writing about this subject was not the result of his absorbing the influence of the Slavophiles, but related to the historical reality of his period. One can also argue that the contemptuous and reserved attitude of the peoples of Europe towards the Russians was a historical fact in the history of Russia, and Khomiakov's writing about this subject Khomiakov reflects the reality in which he lived. Nevertheless, it should be noted that complaints regarding the contemptuous attitude of the neighboring peoples towards that of the author was one of the typical and most explicit topic of writing by the propagators of nationalism in Eastern and Central Europe during the second half of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, and that they fall into a common tradition. For example, within the framework of the public and cultural discourse in Russia such complaints were influenced by the romantic teaching of the Russian-Ukrainian philosopher Aleksandr Potebnia,⁵⁵ who borrowed many philosophical elements from the teachings of the German philosophers, Friedrich Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835) and Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803).

3.10. The Role of the Russians and of the Jews in Creating Negative Images in the Eyes of Foreign Nations

Both Gordon and Khomiakov imposed a portion of the responsibility for the distorted opinions held by foreigners regarding their people upon members of their own people. The Jews, according to Gordon, and the Russians, according to Khomiakov, both bear responsibility for the negative image created of their nation. In their opinion, a number of their countrymen are afflicted with self-hatred, and it is they who deride and denounce their own people and country. This causes grave damage to those same people, for if their own countrymen and their own flesh and blood see them as so bad, how can they complain about strangers?

⁵⁴ Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 225.

⁵⁵ Aleksandr Potebnia (1835–1891) was a Russian-Ukrainian philosopher and linguist active in the Russian Empire. He constructed a theory of language and consciousness that later influenced the thinking of his Russian and Ukrainian philosophers, linguists, psychologists, and scholars of literature.

It is interesting to take note of the different reasons for the improper behavior of some of their countrymen as enumerated by Gordon and Khomiakov. Gordon mentions the phenomenon of apostates, who often denigrate Judaism using the knowledge of sources that they acquired before they left Judaism. Admittedly, this knowledge is usually superficial, and they often falsify the sources and their meaning, whether through ignorance or deliberately. One may speculate that they do this in order to justify themselves, but this does not detract from the seriousness of their act, as denunciation that comes from the side of the Jews, particularly when they have a certain knowledge of the sources, leaves a powerful and non-eradicable impression on the opinion of the broad Russian public.

As against that, the reasons attributed to those Russians who denounce their own people vary, according to Khomiakov's explanation of this phenomenon, the main reason being the predominant mood among the Russian intelligentsia, who tend to excessively admire anything Western or foreign—and for that reason view with contempt their own Russian national tradition.

Thus, Gordon describes the story of the apostate Jew Asher Temkin as follows:

In 1835 an apostate Jew named Temkin published in St. Petersburg a polemical pamphlet against the Jews, *The Paved Way*. . . . In his attacks on the Jews . . . [Temkin] makes use of ammunition used by many [apostate Jews] before him. . . . His main attacks were directed against the primary bastion of Judaism, namely, the Talmud.⁵⁶

Gordon also denounces manifestations of antisemitism on the part of other apostates, imposing upon them great responsibility for libeling the Jews: "The ignorance and lack of decency of these apostates and antisemites did not prevent them . . . from causing noticeable damage to the Jews."⁵⁷ He goes on to mock the criticism of people of this sort against Judaism, and attempts to refute their words and to show that they are based upon absurdity and upon an a priori anti-Jewish tendency.⁵⁸

These ideas burned in Gordon's bones, as repeats them in various contexts. One gains the impression that he has taken upon himself part of the responsibility for the improper behavior of some of his fellow Jews, beating his breast on their account, and bewailing the fact that these destroyers of the good name of Jewry come from within. These Jews, whether because they are apostates or for some

56 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 199–200.

57 Ibid., 201–202.

58 Ibid., 202–203.

other reason that they keep to themselves, act as a kind of evil plague, inflicting torments on the suffering body of the Jewish community in Russia. One must make every effort, in Gordon's opinion, to frustrate their harmful activity in every area in which they operate.⁵⁹

Khomiakov, in expressions views very similar to these of Gordon, also points out the responsibility of the Russian intelligentsia for creating a negative image of Russia in Western eyes. People with an established social position and great influence within Russia, especially when they travel abroad, express contempt for deeply rooted Russian values, and excessively value those of foreign cultures, merely because these are not Russian: "Every Russian person thinks that someone who speaks only French or German is more learned and enlightened than one who speaks only Russian."⁶⁰ In Khomiakov's opinion, the Russians are guilty of a lack of sufficient self-respect. This phenomenon damages the national prestige of Russia and must be uprooted. In his opinion, the Russians are themselves responsible for the bad opinion of Westerners concerning Russia, its culture, and its image:

It is only our longing for everything that is foreign, our intense desire to resemble everything foreign—only these suffice to cut us off from the authentic sources of our intellectual and spiritual life. . . . And in this way we shall cut ourselves off finally from our spiritual essence and from the history of our fatherland in favor of the West—all these are an example of that blind faith with which we accept all the pretenses of the West and by this prove our intellectual subjugation to it.⁶¹

Like Gordon, he returns to this subject repeatedly in his writings and develops it over and over again.⁶² Ideas in this spirit were also expressed by Russian thinkers of a later period, such as Dostoyevsky, a fact that indicates that opinions of this type were widely accepted in Russia over a period of many years, both prior to Khomiakov and during his own time.⁶³

59 Ibid., 77, note 20.

60 Khomiakov, "Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii," 100.

61 Ibid., 92–93.

62 Khomiakov, "K serbam," 185, 186, 187.

63 Dostoevskii, *Dnevnik pisatel'ia*, 1873, 55.

3.11. The Blind Wish to Imitate Everything Foreign, Both in Russian Society and Among the Jewish Public

Gordon and Khomiakov supported opposing viewpoints. Whereas Khomiakov's goal was to support everything Russian and to protect it from foreign influences, however worthwhile and good these may have been, Gordon was specifically concerned with influencing his people to adopt worthwhile innovations from the surrounding alien society and to guide them for the welfare and benefit of their brethren among Russian Jewry.

As might be expected from an explicit Slavophile such as Khomiakov, he criticizes members of the Russian aristocracy who negate or humble themselves before the West. According to him, members of the aristocracy attempt to resemble people of the West in every respect, adopting their manner of thought and submitting to them as a servant to his master.⁶⁴ In his opinion, this is an invalid or even harmful phenomenon, which needs to be avoided. True, Khomiakov argues that it is permissible to learn positive things from the people of the West, but under no circumstance may one imitate them out of "blind faith." In his words:

The longing for every foreign thing, the powerful desire to emulate every thing which has been learned from foreign nations—all these have already managed to cut us off from our roots and from the source of our spiritual and intellectual life. While we continue to love the soil of our dear homeland, we have nevertheless cut ourselves off with all our efforts and all our intellectual efforts from our history and our spiritual essence.⁶⁵

According to Khomiakov, the longing for everything which is "not from here," which is not Russian, and the desire to resemble foreign examples have cut the Russians off from the authentic sources of their intellectual and spiritual life, from their spiritual essence. In the manner of the Slavophiles, Khomiakov criticizes those members of his people who tend to adopt the customs of other nations and to imitate them.

Although Gordon, unlike Khomiakov, supports openness towards other peoples, he nevertheless also strongly criticizes excessively assimilated Jews. When he speaks about assimilated Jews, he makes use of the same pattern of

⁶⁴ Khomiakov, "K serbam," 88–92, 185.

⁶⁵ Khomiakov, "K serbam," 93, 22.

thought and even the same linguistic formulae as used by Russian Slavophiles such as Khomiakov. Gordon preaches the strengthening of the unity and brotherhood of all the Jews spread throughout the world, writing that:

The Jews of France and Germany, England and Italy, attempt with all their strength to be French or German, English or Italian, and to cease to be Jews. They speak the language of their country and practice its customs. . . . They forgot the source from which they were hewn and the brotherhood between them and their brethren living in other countries has been broken.⁶⁶

The influence of Slavophile teaching is particularly strongly felt in Gordon's writing when he criticizes the assimilated Jews. Both the Slavophiles and Gordon criticize the blind desire to resemble others and to become like them, either in the Russian society or within the Jewish public.

Gordon strongly criticizes those Jews who imitate the practices of the Russians. He draws a comparison between the Israelites who left Egypt and the assimilated Russian Jews of his day. In his opinion, they both behave towards their masters like a slave with a pierced ear,⁶⁷ imitating their masters in every matter, indiscriminately and with blind faith.

Gordon also criticizes the Jews' adoption of specific Gentile customs, particularly when they are improper and shameful, such as the practice of certain Jews who drink to excess and go about in public intoxicated, like the Russians. He writes: "In recent days, many of our brethren have learned to imitate the acts of our neighbors and to behave like the most despicable among them, emulating them in their practices and in their behavior."⁶⁸

Gordon relates an imaginary story about two friends, one of whom is a Jew named Hirsch, and the other is a Russian called Harisha. Once, when Hirsch suffered some misfortune and "his face was angry," the Russian, Harisha, suggested to him that:

"You remove anger from your heart and evil from your flesh. . . . Let us go down to the tavern. . . . Moreover, tomorrow is Purim, and one is obligated to get drunk on Purim!" But the Jew, although he was wise and loyal to the ways of Judaism, even though his first name was

66 Gordon, "Tezlochit shel plaiton," 198.

67 Ibid., 199.

68 Ibid., 249.

similar to that of the Gentile, rejects this improper suggestion: “Leave me alone!” he answered angrily. . . .⁶⁹

As follows from this imaginary story, according to Gordon, one ought not to imitate the improper and shameful customs of the Gentiles. To do so would harm everything: the health of the Jew himself, and the natural image of the Jewish people generally.

3.12. The Need to Preserve the Authentic National Language and to Develop It as a Basic Component of Nationalism

Both Khomiakov, like other Slavophiles, as well as Gordon and other Jewish Maskilim, saw in the preservation and cultivation of the national language a supreme value for building nationalism. The national language is a decisive contributory factor in establishing national identity of its speakers. Khomiakov writes:

[The members of our people] are prepared to change all of our customs and to adopt in their place foreign customs, and they are again prepared to alter these adopted customs according to instructions of foreigners. They are even (and it is truly shameful and scandalous to even mention this) prepared to change their language, which is the praiseworthy language of very origin of Slavic [culture], the most ancient and best language among all the languages of the peoples—even that they are willing to treat with contempt and to abandon. . . . And in its place they have adopted the poorest and most miserable dialect among all the languages of Europe [that is, French]. This is total craziness; these are the phenomena of these times.⁷⁰

According to Khomiakov, the attachment to the original language of the people is one of the essential conditions for sustaining the value of the nation. Gordon also preaches on behalf of strengthening the unique nationalism of the Jewish people, one of whose necessary conditions is the preservation of the national language. He writes:

And now, dear children of Zion, who take pride in their enlightenment to imitate like monkeys the nations surrounding them. Yet is this not all their glory and honor, that those that see them do not recognize that

⁶⁹ Ibid., 250.

⁷⁰ Khomiakov, “K serbam,” 186.

they are the seed blessed of the Lord? And they teach their tongues, each man to speak in the language of their country and in the language of each people, and their own language is stuck in their mouths. Who shall turn about their hearts to be one, to love their people and the source from which they have come and to be proud in it as against all the nations. . . .⁷¹

According to Gordon, the loss of the national language leads, in the final analysis, to loss of national identity, as may be seen from a number of examples among “the members of the new generation who grow up in their youth without the true God, without Torah and faith, and without knowledge of our language or of our history.”⁷²

When Gordon praises the Hebrew language, his heart is filled with wonder and his words are reminiscent of the Slavophiles when they speak about the Russian language. Gordon intensely loves the Hebrew language; he wishes to see its cultivation, preservation, and development: “The language, the holy language, blossoms; it is renewed like an eagle and shall return to the days of its youth. . . . What more can we do for our language on the day that they will speak on its behalf?” He goes on to argue that use of the Hebrew language, its expansion, and its adaptation to everyday modern needs will lead to the renewal of the people of Israel: “This is our sign that Israel takes pride in its poverty because it is suitable to it, but in truth it is something tremendous, and its house shall soon be rebuilt.”⁷³

The use of the national tongue, its preservation and cultivation—all these are understood as an exclusive element in the shaping of the value of nationalism among the Russian Slavophiles. However, these ideas also reflect the influence of German romanticism, which had penetrated Russian philosophy and culture—among other channels, through the writings of Aleksandr Potebnia.⁷⁴

Potebnia’s general worldview took shape under the influence of German philosophers who advocated idealism, such as Kant, Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. Potebnia’s linguistic perception was shaped in particular by the works of Friedrich Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), as well as of his followers, such as Heymann Steinthal, Johann Herbart, and Rudolf Hermann Lotze.

71 Gordon, “Tezlochit shel plaiton,” 199.

72 Gordon, “Ha-Evke?,” 259.

73 Gordon, “Tezlochit shel plaiton,” 219.

74 See O. P. Presniakov, *Poetika poznaniia i tvorchestva: Teoriia slovesnosti A. Potebni* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1980).

Potebnia borrowed most of his ideas in the field of linguistic research from Humboldt, for example, the conception of language as an expression of the psychological intricacies of the speaker, and the conception of discourse as providing a mental outlet to the speaker, and not just as a means of conveying information, as was commonly thought before. A Russian scholar of Potebnia's heritage, Nikolai Bezlepkin, compared Potebnia's ideas with Humboldt's, and found that most of Potebnia's ideas have a parallel in ideas in Humboldt's published works.⁷⁵

The Maskilim, such as Y. L. Gordon, became acquainted with the writings of Potebnia in Russian, and from them they also discovered Humboldt's ideas. Even though the Maskilim could read German without difficulties, thanks to their knowledge of Yiddish, it was easier for them to access Potebnia's writings in Russian than to procure Humboldt's writings in German from abroad. So, it seems almost certain that the understanding of language as an essential value in the shaping of nationalism penetrated the consciousness of the Jewish Maskilim, including Gordon, under the influence of the Russian thinkers whom they read extensively.

3.13. The Disaster of the Tower of Babel Confronts Every Nation That Foregoes the Preservation of Its Original National Language

Both Khomiakov and Gordon warn their compatriots against the loss of their national identity, expressed, among other things, in foregoing their historical national language. They each predict, in a kind of black prophecy, what will happen to their people in the event of such a sad occurrence, each of them using the biblical image of the tower of Babylon, in order to emphasize the magnitude of the disaster that awaits their people and further strengthen their words. Khomiakov writes: "We have exchanged our national values, not for universal human values, but for the variety of colors of Babel. Therefore, the Russian person has become alien in a general way, not only towards his own people, but also towards every other nation; he has become alien even to himself."⁷⁶ Similarly, Gordon writes:

Listen attentively and hear all the different languages that can be heard on the lips of this people which has been beaten to fragments. The

75 N. I. Bezlepkin, "Nemetskii idealizm i russkaia filosofiiia iazyka," in *Russkaia i evropeiskaia filosofiiia: Puti skhozhdeniia*, ed. E. M. Ananieva, A. M. Bol'shakov, and E. G. Sokolov (St. Petersburg: Kafedra, 1997), 165–171.

76 Aleksei Khomiakov, "Razgovor v podmoskovnom," in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova*, 3rd ed. (Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia na Strastnom bul'vare, 1886–1906), 154.

language of those who built the tower in the valley of Shinar was a clear language, a refreshing language, by comparison to this garbled language . . . Who shall create for them a clear speech, that they may have one language and one tongue that will be used in the land.⁷⁷

The image of the tower of Babel, which appears both in Khomiakov's and in Gordon's writings indicates, if not a direct relationship between the writings of the two, at least the fact that both authors drew upon a common cultural source—namely, the Biblical images often used by Russian critics and thinkers.

3.14. The Need to Adopt the Accomplishments and Wisdom of Other Nations for the Benefit of Our People and to Advance Our National Goals

The Russian Slavophiles, including Khomiakov, were prepared to accept innovations from other nations, particularly in the area of science, and to incorporate them within the Russian way of life. True, Khomiakov made the acceptance of such innovations conditional on the fact that they would assume an authentic Russian character and coloration, so that their foreign origin would no longer be recognizable. According to Khomiakov, science must adapt itself to the Russian way of thinking and of education, which would contribute to the absorption of the accomplishments of science “among us,” in Russia, in a harmonious way, without causing a split between “ours”—that is, the authentical national—and that which was alien and foreign. Khomiakov writes: “Science . . . must strive . . . to connect with Russian education. Science will draw upon our precious national sources, which are deep and clear. . . . Science alone is capable of healing the deep wound of the inner split among us.”⁷⁸

In the spirit of that time, Khomiakov does not distinguish between the study of culture and the study of concrete things, as in contemporary science. He refers to both of them by the same name: “science.” When he calls upon members of his people to become experts in sciences, he also refers to the idea that there is benefit in members of the Russian people learning the habits of other cultures.

In an article titled “A Conversation [in a Village] near Moscow,”⁷⁹ Khomiakov describes a series of discussions between four Russian aristocrats regarding the preservation and cultivation of matters relating to the Russian nation. Among other things, they discuss the contribution of science to preserving the nation,

77 Gordon, “Tezlochit shel plaiton,” 198–199.

78 Khomiakov, “K serbam,” 100–101.

79 Khomiakov, “Razgovor v podmoskovnom,” 136–162.

using the word “science” also to refer to the study of alien cultures. According to the speakers in this article, the study of foreign cultures—German, British, French, Italian—will help the Russian people to arrive at a national self-definition, as they will become better able to understand themselves and their difference from other nations. Khomiakov argues that only after learning foreign cultures will the members of the Russian people understand their national uniqueness and thereby succeed in defining their Russian nation in the best possible way. He writes: “When we return home from studying the foreign cultures, we will bring with us a clear and well defined worldview.”⁸⁰ According to Khomiakov, once the Russians will have learned exact sciences and foreign cultures, they will be able to integrate among them and be able to use them for the benefit of their own people. This is the correct way, in his opinion, for creating true learning and erudition. He writes: “In his way there will be developed the integration. Such an integration will be accepted as justified by rational consciousness, as the longing for living knowledge and for its integration within of life are the longing for erudition.”⁸¹

To summarize, Khomiakov is aware that modernity brings with it special needs, and that in order to deal with them one also needs to learn from the West. However, this learning must be limited and consistent with the spirit of the Russian people:

The customs cannot remain fixed or frozen for . . . the demands of life alter them [the customs] in accordance with the changes within life itself. The inner feeling of the people . . . is that which serves as the criterion for these gradual changes, to their degree of lawfulness and their degree of necessity.⁸²

In addition to Khomiakov, other Slavophiles also supported the view that one ought to learn from the sciences and cultures of other peoples, but that this knowledge must have a Russian character and be adapted to the needs of the Russian people. Yuri Samarin, who was among those that formulated the ideology of the Slavophiles, similar to Khomiakov, also articulated the need to preserve the Russian character in the context of limited and cautious relation to certain new things from the West.

80 Ibid., 143.

81 Ibid., 136.

82 Ibid., 192.

Samarin, while an enthusiastic patriot of his homeland, together with that supported the incorporation of certain things within the societal life, culture and political life of Russia, even if the source of these innovations came from outside. Samarin thought that the absorption of certain new ideas from the West could specifically strengthen the authentic Russian spirit. For example, he wrote that the spread of printing in Russia, the printing of newspapers in a manner similar to their publication in the West, the strengthening of the system of civil law in Russia, and the strengthening of the system of taxation—all these contributed to strengthening the beloved Russian motherland.⁸³

In this way, actually Slavophiles echo their rival group, the Westernizers. For example, Peter Chaadayev, who, as we mentioned earlier, supported views opposite to those of the Slavophiles, argued that the Russians need to learn from other peoples and to make use of this knowledge for the welfare and benefit of the Russian people as a whole.⁸⁴ The difference is that the Slavophiles advised acting in a more limited and cautious manner.

The conflict or vacillation between the wish to preserve the Russian religious and cultural heritage and the desire to benefit from useful innovations of foreign origin characterized Gordon's thought as well. Gordon also attempted to find the delicate balance between cultivating authentic Jewish values and openness to the Russian world and its accomplishments and innovations. He expressed himself regarding the need to mix between "the wisdom of all people" and "the wisdom of Israel":

Had the kingdom of Israel continued to exist to this day, the split between the wisdom of Israel and the wisdom of all human beings would not be as sharp as it is today, for the elders of Israel and its sages and judges would have taken counsel together not to refrain from the ways of the world and the needs of the time within which they live.⁸⁵

As against the cautious and measured approach to innovations of alien origin on the part of the Slavophiles, Gordon was more open to accepting new things. He writes: "We will allow the beauty of Japheth to dwell in the tents of Shem, and will graft alien shoots upon the vine of Israel to make it better and more

83 Tsimbareva, "Vstuplenie."

84 Peter Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, trans. and intro Mary-Barbara Zeldin (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1969), 52.

85 Gordon, "Tezlochit shel plaiton," 202.

beautiful.”⁸⁶ He continues in this vein by saying: “What then can prevent us from grafting this alien shoot [of Japheth] upon the vine of Israel, so that we may have both fruit and flowers, so that our tree of life may be both good to eat and desirable to the eyes?!”⁸⁷

According to Gordon, true enlightenment is only possible through an integration or combination of Judaism with general knowledge: “If you are among the masters of true culture, and the light of knowledge has shined upon you, then you shall walk in the darkness by its light, and even when you return to your own narrow dwelling, you shall know how to preserve it from dirt and filth and other things.”⁸⁸

There is an important difference between the views of Khomiakov and Samarin, on the one hand, and those of Gordon, on the other. The Slavophiles specifically advocated self-enclosure within the internal world of Russia, whereas the group of Jewish Maskilim to which Gordon belonged supported the opposite approach, that of openness to the non-Russian world, with the goal of learning from it. Their standing in society was also different. During the second half of the nineteenth century, the general Russian public already recognized the great cultural, social, economic, and technological accomplishments of the West, and the need to adapt them to the Russian national character in order to enable the further development of Russian spiritual and cultural world. On the other hand, Gordon’s idea of openness to the West still encountered opposition in the traditional Jewish world of that period. Traditional Jewish public, and Rabbis in particular, objected to the adoption of foreign achievements.

3.15. “Our People is Unable to Close the Gaps as Quickly as We Hoped”

Gordon’s advocacy of learning the others’ ways also echoes the thought of the Westernizers, albeit with a different impulse. For example, Gordon and Chaadayev, one of the central figures in the Westernizing movement in Russia, both critically reflect on the gap between their own people and others.

Gordon complains that the powerful people in Russia, such as the rulers, place pressure upon the heads of the Jewish community to apply means so as to bring the Jews closer to the Russian Orthodox, something that greatly troubled Gordon. He writes: “The government expects the religious Jews to change

86 Ibid., 216.

87 Ibid., 223.

88 Ibid.

their very nature and to draw close to the Russians.”⁸⁹ In point of fact, Gordon resists the pressure that came from the governmental authorities to whom the Jews were subject. Gordon felt that he was standing in the breach, and that the obligation and responsibility for protecting his Jewish brethren from the government’s activities in the realm of spirit, culture and religion, in which he saw signs of violence and coercion, was imposed upon himself.

Peter Chaadayev was likewise aware of the gap existing between his own people, the Russians, and other nations—meaning the other peoples of Europe. He saw that Russia was behind other countries in terms of its development. He was troubled by these gaps, but in a different way than Gordon. Chaadayev would have liked to see Russia advance more quickly and overtake more quickly the other nations, but this was not happening at the desired pace. In practice, Chaadayev complains that Russia was barely advancing in the direction of the West, something which troubled him a great deal.⁹⁰

3.16. Seeking the Proper Balance between the National and the Universal Dimension

Aleksei Khomiakov called upon the members of the Russian people to participate in building a true Russian nationalism. He also warned against those who erroneously thought that they could cut themselves off from the Russian people as whole and engage in matters unconnected to the homeland—as justified, worthwhile and as pure as these matters might be. In truth, Khomiakov argues, such people cannot hold themselves above all the problems of the Russian people, but will in the end remain hanging in the air, unconnected to anything. According to his claim, those people who ignore the national problems of the Russian people will ultimately remain alone, without any national homeland. He writes:

There are [people in Russia] who think that they can manage without their nation and to go . . . into lofty, disconnected, pure realms. But of course they do not succeed, but only exhaust themselves to the point of death, and in this way, lacking in life, are unable to take off but are caught in the air without movement.⁹¹

89 Gordon, *Lilmod et sefat ha-moledet*, 112–113.

90 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 43–44.

91 Khomiakov, “Razgovor v podmoskovnom,” 163.

Khomiakov vacillates between the national-Russian approach and the universal-human one, and in the final analysis expresses a clear preference for the national side.

Other Slavophiles apart from him also reflected about the question of the proper balance between the need to strengthen the Russian-national aspect and the need for involvement in the society of members of different nations. Konstantin Aksakov (1817–1860),⁹² who was one of the founding fathers of the ideology of the Slavophile movement, devoted a great deal of attention to the issue of the place of the Russian nations among other peoples. Aksakov tended to prefer the Russian national aspect the universal-human, or European.

In 1855, Aksakov published one of his most important essays, “On the Inner Condition of Russia,” in which he argued that the Russian people is not merely a people “of a government and a state”—that is to say, the concepts of political sovereignty and statehood are alien to the Russian people. A secular, alienated government, political arrangements based upon a rational constitutional approach—all these are unnatural to the Russian people, having been brought to Russia from Europe. According to his view, the authentic Russian people was organized in agricultural communities and ruled by the elders of the community on the basis of rules of ethics and religion, and not by the laws of the country. Aksakov goes on to argue that Russia must return to the rule of the communal elders and to forego the constitutional rule of the state—and thereby return to its national roots. The author suggests that Russia choose the national path over the universal-human one, which is the way of Europe.

Gordon likewise vacillated a great deal regarding the proper balance between the authentically Jewish and the universal-human. But, unlike both Khomiakov and Aksakov, he arrived at a different conclusion—namely, that one could find a compromise and a way of integrating the two, without adhering to the national aspect alone. He writes:

Your children will learn the languages of all the nations and will take shelter in the shade of all the nations, all the people, but they must not forge also the language of their forefathers and know what happened to them. They may change their faces [that is, their physical appearance] and their clothing as they see fit, but they must guard

92 Konstantin Sergeevich Aksakov (1817–1860) was a Russian poet, writer, historian, researcher of the Russian language, and literature critic, one of the earliest and most notable Slavophiles. He wrote plays, social criticism, and histories of the ancient Russian social order. His father, Sergey Aksakov, was a writer, and his younger brother, Ivan Aksakov, was a journalist.

their souls and prepare their hearts. They may pass over holy flesh [a reference to not eating kosher meat], but do not take their holy spirit away from them.⁹³

In 1863, Gordon published his famous poem “Awaken, My People!,” in which he articulated his view that says that one must integrate the universal and the authentically Jewish. He writes: “How long will you be apart, / a guest like Other? / . . . To wisdom open your heart: / Speak their tongue, seek the light.” Particularly famous was one line from this poem: “Be a man when you go out, / and a Jew within your tent.”⁹⁴

The attempts to reconcile the national and the universal-human element was common to both the Slavophiles and the Jewish Maskilim; however, their conclusions were opposite. Whereas the Slavophiles called for isolation and shutting oneself off within one’s own national culture, the Maskilim sought a way of knowing the external world and being connected to it, while preserving and remaining connected to the national and the deeply rooted.

3.17. Criticism of the Conservative Elements within Our People Who Are Not Prepared to Progress towards Enlightened Europe

The “Westernized” Russians complained that their country and the members of their nation were backwards and not developing towards the developed nations of Europe; they encouraged Russia to close the gap in all areas. For example, Chaadayev, in his first “Philosophical Letter,” complains about the fact that the Russian people are not prepared to absorb cultural innovation from foreigners: “There is something in our blood that causes us to reject true progress.” While all the peoples of Europe were developing their culture and improving their social, political, economic, and legal situation, the Russian people remained enslaved under the Tatars,⁹⁵ which held up their advance and development. But even after the liberation from Tatar domination, rather than following the European peoples who had progressed in a significant way throughout the period that the Russian people was subjugated, Russia is not prepared to do so but prefers to sink into the enslavement of its own unwillingness to progress.⁹⁶

93 Gordon, “Tezlochit shel plaiton,” 202.

94 Gordon, “Hakitzah ami,” 17.

95 The Mongol Empire invaded Kievan Rus in years 1237–1240, destroying numerous cities, including Ryazan, Kolomna, Moscow, Vladimir, and Kyiv. Thus started what is called the Mongol, or Tatar, “yoke,” which ended in 1480.

96 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 41–42.

Gordon's criticism is very close to that of the Westernizers. We find in his writings, both in Hebrew and in Russian, numerous expressions criticizing the pious and excessively tradition-bound rabbis, who prevent their people from learning from other peoples and advancing in the spirit of the times.

3.18. Summary

The movements of national liberation that broke into history in a striking way in the second half of the nineteenth century were common among many nations, particularly among the ethnic minorities of Eastern Europe, and especially in Russia. These movements strove for national redemption, independence, and liberation in many areas— religion, culture, citizenship, society, and politics. The national consciousness that moved them found expression in varied ways, assuming different guises in each nation and in every ethnic group, according to their particular nature.

The phenomenon of general national awakening did not pass over the Jewish communities of Russia. One needs to examine the nationalist awakening among the Jews of Russia against the background of the geographical, historical, and broad ideological background, as part of the same spirit of national awakening which swept other ethnic minorities during that same period. As proof of this, I have presented passages from Gordon's writings, who was an outstanding representative of the Haskalah movement in Russia, as contrasted with typical leaders of the Slavophile movement, such as Aleksei Khomiakov, Yuri Samarin, Konstantin Aksakov, and Westernizers such as Peter Chaadayev. A considerable resemblance may be seen between their respective statements of ideological content dealing with national revival. This resemblance indicates that the nationalist thought of the Haskalah was an integral part of the intellectual mosaic of a nationalist tendency that was widespread among intellectual circles in Russia.

Unlike many other Maskilim, Gordon had full command of the Russian language and were deeply involved in Russian cultural and social life. He was well aware of what was going on around them and was influenced by the atmosphere of nationalist awakesness in Russia. Gordon and other Maskilim who attempted to participate in Russian culture, borrowed many of its ideas and even linguistic formulations and images, which they applied to Jewish spiritual life. The national awakening of which they spoke was a kind of attractive utopian dream, which went far beyond anything that could have been imagined by the suffering and oppressed Jewish communities in the Russian exile during the second half of the nineteenth century.

Chapter 4: A Comparison between the National Views of L. S. Pinsker and Those of Petr Chaadayev, Nikolai Berdyaev, and Vyacheslav Ivanov

4.1. L. S. Pinsker and His National Aspirations

The Haskalah (Jewish Enlightenment) movement and the pro-Zionist Chibbat Zion shared a number of spiritual characteristics with other national movements of that period in Russia and Eastern Europe. There are clear parallels between the approaches to national issues among figures from the Jewish Haskalah and Zionist movements and those of Russian nationalist movements.

L. S. Pinsker supported Gordon's national views. He considered it a great honor to join Gordon in all activities on behalf of the Jewish people. Pinsker's personal letter to Gordon dated November 13, 1882, reveals his admiration for his addressee and calls on Gordon to be active in awakening the national movement among Russian Jews.¹

Like Gordon, many of Pinsker's ideas were influenced by the national atmosphere in the Russian Empire of that period. In this chapter, I compare the ideas of Russian thinkers such as Petr Chaadayev to those of Pinsker and show that there was much in common between them and that their ideas have correspondencies in criticism, journalism, and ideological discourse in Russia of that time.

4.2. Geography as the Most Important Factor in the Development of Every Nation

One of the main factors in the self-determination and development of any people is geography. In other words, the settlement of any people in a certain geographical area rather than its dispersion in a diaspora is what strengthens the national feeling of that people and makes it into an independent national entity. Among the Russian thinkers, Chaadayev in particular argues that the

1 Leo Pinsker, "Letter to J. L. Gordon," in his *Road to Freedom. Writings and Addresses*, intro. Ben-Zion Netanyahu (New York: Scopus Publishing Company, 1944), 118.

geographical factor is the most important in the development of the Russian people²:

There is one fact which absolutely dominates our progress through the ages, which runs through our whole history, which encompasses in a way all its philosophy, which occurs at all periods of our social life and determines their character. This fact is both the one essential element of our political greatness and the true cause of our intellectual weakness: this fact is the fact of geography. . . . All of our history is the product of the nature of that immense land which destiny has granted us. By dispersing us in all directions and scattering us from the first days of our national existence; it instilled in us a blind obedience to the force of things, to any power that declared itself our master. . . . We are merely a geographical product of the broad expanses where we have been cast by a mysterious . . . force. . . . However, this physiology of our country, with its undoubted faults in the present may lead to great advantages in the future.³

Pinsker also regards the geographical factor as crucial to the fate of the Jewish people: "It [the Jewish people] does not have its own homeland. It has many lands [but] it does not have a center of its own, a center of gravity. It does not have a government of its own or a representative body. It is everywhere but is nowhere at home."⁴

Pinsker argues that the *galuth* (dispersion) defines the very character of the life of the Jewish people. The lack of a national homeland had tragic consequences for the Jewish people in the diaspora:

Aspiring to the preservation of our material existence, unfortunately we have too often been compelled to ignore our moral worth. . . . We

2 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 178. This fragment is omitted in another translation: Peter Chaadayev, *The Major Works*, trans. and commentary Raymond McNally, intro. Richard Pipes (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969). See the original Russian text: P. Ia. Chaadaev, "Apologiya sumashedshego," in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis'ma* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1991), vol. 1, 538.

3 Petr Chaadayev, "Otryvki i raznye mysli (1828–1850-e)," in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis'ma* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1991), vol. 1, 480–481. No translation of this fragment exists in either English edition of Chaadayev's writings.

4 Leo Pinsker, "Avtoemansipatsiia. Prizyv russkogo evreia k svojim soplemennikam," in Teodor Gerts'l', *Evreiskoe gosudarstvo. Opyt sovremennogo resheniia evreiskogo voprosa*, ed. S. Gorodetskii and O. Libkin, intro. Khaim Ben-Iakov (Moscow: Tekst, 2008), 145.

have served other peoples as a ball to play with. . . . We were tolerated more willingly to the degree that our national consciousness was more flexible and elastic in the hands of those who played with us.⁵ . . . Thus, we helplessly raced around in a vicious circle for thousands of years, allowing blind fate to rule over us.⁶

In Pinsker's opinion, the lack of a geographical homeland had led to social, behavioral and conceptual distortions in the collective consciousness of the Jewish communities throughout the world. In the view of Ahad Ha'am, Pinsker viewed auto-emancipation not as salvation from an external enemy but as a restoration of the national honor of the Jewish people.⁷

4.3. The Degradation of Every People without a Clear National Agenda in the Eyes of Other Peoples

Chaadayev complains that other peoples held the Russian people in contempt. In his opinion, "Never was a nation so flogged, never was a country so dragged in the mud, never was so much of its filth thrown back into the face of the public."⁸ Interestingly, Khomiakov expresses similar ideas. He also gives reasons for this contempt, which the Russian people must disregard as much as possible:

The negative attitude of other peoples toward us [Russians] clearly derives from two causes: a profound recognition of the difference between all the elements of the spiritual and social development of Russia and those of Western Europe, and involuntary disappointment with that independent force which has required and demanded all the rights of equality . . . in the society of European peoples. . . . We can not expect complete love and fraternity but we can and should expect respect.

5 Ibid., 159.

6 Ibid., 173–174.

7 Ahad Ha'am, "Gordyi evrei," introduction to Leo Pinsker, "Avtoemansipatsiia. Prizyv russkogo evreia k svoim soplemennikam," in Teodor Gertsl', *Evreiskoe gosudarstvo. Opyt sovremennogo resheniia evreiskogo voprosa*, ed. S. Gorodetskii and O. Libkin, intro. Khaim Ben-Iakov (Moscow: Tekst, 2008), 5.

8 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 177; Peter Chaadayev, "The Apologia of a Madman," in his *The Major Works*, trans. and comm. Raymond McNally, intro. Richard Pipes (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 218; Chaadaev, "Apologiia sumashedshego," 537.

Chaadayev complains that the Russian people brings out the worst in the Europeans: "It is strange that Russia alone apparently has the 'privilege' of arousing the worst sentiments in the European heart."⁹

The claim that their people do not receive the honor it deserves from other peoples, that the surrounding peoples despise their people unjustly, is often made by writers of the period, and especially by those belonging to ethnic minorities in Eastern Europe. This claim is also made by Pinsker. Pinsker dwells on the idea that the peoples despise and hate the Jews:

The world has seen in this people [the Jews] the sinister specter of a dead man wandering among the living. . . . This fear of the Jewish specter, which for centuries has spread from one people to another, has continued to grow. It led to the well known prejudice which in turn . . . prepared the grounds for Judeophobia. . . . Judeophobia then became legitimized among all the people with which the Jews came into contact.¹⁰

4.4. The Lack of a Solid Cultural Basis Related to the Lack of a National Agenda

An idea that recurs in the writings of many Russian thinkers, Chaadayev as well, is that the Russian people are lacking in a common cultural basis with other surrounding peoples:

Somehow divorced from time, we have not been touched by the universal education of mankind. That wonderful interconnection of human ideas in the succession of the centuries, that history of the human mind which brought man to the state in which he is today in the rest of the world, has had no influence upon us.¹¹

9 Khomiakov, "Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii," 4.

10 Pinsker, "Avtoemansipatsiia," 147–148.

11 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 34; Peter Chaadayev, "The Philosophical Letters," in his *The Major Works*, trans. and comm. Raymond McNally, introduction by Richard Pipes (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969); Petr Chaadaev, "Filosoficheskie pis'ma," in his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis'ma* (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1991), vol. 1, 323. See also K. G. Isupov and V. F. Boikov, "Lichnost' P. Ia. Chaadaeva i ego filosofii istorii," in *Rossiiia glazami russkogo. Chaadaev, Leont'ev, Solov'ev*, ed. and intro. A. F. Zamaleev (St. Petersburg: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1991), 155–168, repr. in *P. Ia. Chaadaev: PRO ET CONTRA. Lichnost' i tvorchestvo Petra Chaadaeva v otsenke russkikh myslitelei i issledovatelei*, ed. D. K. Burlak (St. Petersburg:

In Chaadayev's opinion, the lack of mutual relationships with the surrounding European peoples brought about the sad fact that the Russian people did not respect or value its own history. The erasure of its historical legacy undermined the very basis of the Russian people as a nation: "Cast a look upon the many centuries in our past, upon the expanse of soil we inhabit, and you will find no endearing reminiscence, no venerable memoria, to speak to you powerfully of the past, and to reproduce it for you in a vivid and colorful manner."¹²

Pinsker also laments the lack of a common historical and cultural basis among the Jews:

The Jewish people lack a specific life of its own which is unthinkable without a common language, common customs, and existence on a shared territory. . . . What is lacking for the recognition of a Jewish nationality is that individual national spirit which is characteristic of all other peoples, one that is created by a shared territory. Given the dispersion of Israel, its national spirit can not be preserved. Furthermore, even the memory of their ancient homeland seems to have completely disappeared among the Jews.¹³

Although the culture and history of the Russian people is very different from that of the Jewish people, there are points of similarity in the writings of Pinsker and Chaadayev. Both say that the strengthening of relations between the different communities could help to strengthen the national sentiment. On the other hand, the lack of common cultural elements such as a common language and shared customs harms the national spirit.

4.5. The Place of a Nation among Other Nations

Chaadayev regrets that the Russian people has an especially bad reputation among other peoples:

In a way, one can say that as a people we are an exception to the rule. We belong to that number of nations which do not seem to make up an integral part of the human race, but which exist only to teach the world some great lesson. The lesson which we are destined to give

Russkii khristianskii humanitarnyi institut, 1998), 9–20.

12 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 36; Chaadayev, "The Philosophical Letters," 30; Chaadaev, "Apologiya sumashedshego," 325.

13 Pinsker, "Avtoemansipatsiia," 145.

will, naturally, not be lost: but who know when we shall find ourselves once again in the midst of humanity, and what afflictions we shall experience before we accomplish our destiny?¹⁴ . . . We became the prey of conquerors, and when, freed from foreign yoke, we could, had we not been separated from the common family, have profited from the ideas which had blossomed during this time among our Western brothers, we fell instead into an even harsher servitude, sanctified as it was by the fact of our deliverance.¹⁵

Khomiakov joins Chaadayev in this assertion and compares the place of the Russian people among the family of peoples to that of a neglected stepson: "Are we really so insignificant in comparison with Europe? Within the common family of humanity do we, in fact, resemble an adopted child?"¹⁶

Pinsker also complains of the neglected position of the Jewish people among the other peoples. He especially regrets that the Jews wish to come close to other peoples and thus gradually lose their national consciousness. Despite these efforts, he says, the Jews remain alien to those peoples and do not find a place among them:

Due to their ability to adapt, they [the Jews] adopted features that were foreign to them [but] characteristic of peoples into whose environment fate has cast them. . . . Attempting to fuse with other peoples, to some degree they thoughtlessly sacrificed their own nationality yet, nevertheless, nowhere reached the situation where their fellow citizens recognized their rights as equal to those of the native residents. . . . But what even more held back the Jews from attaining their aspiration to an independent existence was their lack of such a demand.¹⁷

Pinsker, like Khomiakov, uses the image of the adopted child to describe the place of the Jews among the family of peoples: "In most cases they [the Jews]

14 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 37–38; Chaadayev, "The Philosophical Letters," 32–33; Chaadaev, "Filosoficheskie pis'ma," 327.

15 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 43; Chaadayev, "The Philosophical Letters," 39–40; Chaadaev, "Filosoficheskie pis'ma," 331.

16 Aleksei Khomiakov, "Neskol'ko slov o 'Filosoficheskome pis'me,'" *Simvol* 16 (1986): 122ff.

17 Pinsker, "Avtoemansipatsiia," 146.

were treated like a step-child . . . whose rights could be disputed and never like a legally recognized child of the country.”¹⁸

4.6. The Recognition of a Nation among Other Nations

Both Khomiakov and Pinsker claim that a member of a people is always seen as belonging to a specific nation, despite his or her external appearance. Both of them see this in a negative light. Khomiakov says about the way the Russians are seen by other nations: “No matter what he does, no matter how he pretends to be someone else, a Russian is recognized everywhere.”¹⁹ Pinsker has a similar view concerning the negative opinion of the Jews among foreign nations: “Since the Jew is nowhere at home and nowhere is recognized as a native, he remains alien everywhere.”²⁰

4.7. The Weakness of National Consciousness in Different Peoples

Both Khomiakov and Pinsker complain of the weakness of national consciousness in their people. Khomiakov says of the disappearance of national consciousness in Russia: “To the degree that the upper classes of [Russian] society . . . increasingly pursued education that was established on a foreign basis . . . , our education was not the fruit of our own specific historical life.”²¹ Similarly, Pinsker regrets the lack of a national consciousness among Jews: “You [Jews] are despised because you lack self-esteem and have no national consciousness. . . . National consciousness, where is it to be found? . . . We are a flock scattered all over the face of the earth, lacking a shepherd to protect us.”²²

4.8. A Nation’s Lack of Self-Respect

Khomiakov thinks that the reason for the foreigners’ contempt for Russians is that the Russians despise themselves. He writes about the Russians’ lack of self-respect:

I [Khomiakov] presented a conscientious account of the sentiments that the West feels toward us. I said that this combination of fear and

18 Ibid., 153.

19 Khomiakov, “Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii,” 9.

20 Pinsker, “Avtoemansipatsiia,” 153.

21 Khomiakov, “Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii,” 75.

22 Pinsker, “Avtoemansipatsiia,” 157.

hate has been engendered . . . by our own lack of respect for ourselves. We ourselves are responsible for these false conclusions.²³

Pinsker likewise thinks that the contempt of other peoples for the Jews is due to the attitude of the Jews towards themselves. He speaks of the Jews' lack of self-respect as follows:

Aspiring to the preservation of our material existence, unfortunately we all too often are compelled to ignore our own moral worth. We have not noticed that, due to that unworthy although necessary tactic, we have fallen even more deeply in the eyes of our enemies, have become increasingly the object of their scorn.²⁴

4.9. False Expectations of a Miracle: Passivity, Nonintervention in Politics, and Subjection to the Influence of Others

We again emphasize that we have no concrete proof that Pinsker read the works of the Russian intellectuals, including those of Aleksei Khomiakov, Petr Chaadayev, Nikolai Berdyaev,²⁵ or other Slavophiles. However, these Russian intellectuals widely published their articles, and their opinions, in the contemporary Russian press. The Russian-speaking intellectuals of many ethnic minorities in Eastern Europe, who demanded independence in that period, read their articles, adopted their opinions, and applied them to their own nations.

Thus, Berdyaev writes: "The expectation of a social miracle is one of the weaknesses of the Russian people, one of its greatest temptations."²⁶ He continues in a similar vein:

Russia is the most un-statelike, most anarchic country in the world. And the Russian people—the most apolitical of people, one which has never been able to establish order in their land. All real Russians,

23 Khomiakov, "Mnenie inostrantsev o Rossii," 33.

24 Pinsker, "Avtoemansipatsiia," 158–159.

25 Nikolai Aleksandrovich Berdyaev (1874–1948) was a Russian philosopher, moralist, and religious theologian, and a professor of philosophy at the University of Moscow. Berdyaev promoted, and adhered to, Russian Orthodox existentialism and personalism, and his philosophical approach was emotional, bombastic, dogmatic, and controversial. See: Marko Marković, *La Philosophie de l'inégalité et les idées politiques de Nicolas Berdiaev* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1978), 33ff.

26 N. A. Berdiaev, *Filosofia neravenstva. Pis'ma k nedrugam po sotsial'noi filosofii* (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1970), 8.

our national writers, thinkers, publicists, all of them have only expressed the idea of statelessness, a kind of anarchism. Anarchism is a characteristic of the Russian soul.²⁷

Berdyaev also develops these ideas in another article, titled “On the ‘Eternal Feminine’ in the Russian Soul,” as follows:

A great problem of the Russian soul lies in its female passivity, which is ‘feminine’ [in the negative sense], its lack of courage, its tendency toward tying “herself” to some foreign male. . . . That explains why the idea of a Russian state became immersed in a foreign way of life and thinking and often assumed the form of subjection to foreigners.²⁸

Pinsker also writes a great deal about this subject. He especially dwells on the passivity, the faith in the inevitability of suffering, and the lack of national self-respect among the Jews:

instead of really discussing their own situation and working out a rational *ligne de conduit* [French for “a course of action”] for themselves, the Jews appeal to eternal justice, imagining that in this way they will attain something. You are despised because you have no self-esteem and no national consciousness.²⁹

Pinsker condemns the passivity of the Jewish people for generations: “When they [the Gentiles] denigrate, rob, destroy, and insult us, we do not dare defend ourselves and, what is worse, we consider this to be the [natural] order of things.”³⁰

Pinsker ascribes the passive, apolitical nature of the Jewish people to its religion. In his opinion, religion gives rise to the vain illusion that the Jewish people will be helped by God:

Furthermore, messianism, faith in the involvement of a Higher Force which could facilitate our political revival, and the religious conviction

27 N. A. Berdiaev, *Sud'ba Rossii* (Moscow: AST, 2004), 333.

28 N. A. Berdiaev, “O ‘vechno bab'em’ v russkoi dushe,” in his *Sobranie sochinenii* (Paris: YMCA-Press, 1989–1990), vol. 3, 361–362.

29 Pinsker, “Avtoemansipatsiia,” 156–157.

30 Ibid., 160–161.

that we should submissively endure the punishment that God had given us, have freed us from devoting any efforts to our own national liberation, unity, and independence. . . . Thus, we have sunk lower and lower. Deprived of a homeland, we have forgotten about it. Is it not now the time for us to understand how shameful for us this is?³¹

4.10. Nikolai Berdyaev on the National Rights of the Russians and the Jews

The philosopher Nikolai Berdyaev writes a great deal about the national rights of Russians:

You are prepared to recognize the national existence and national rights of the Jews or Poles, the Czechs or the Irish, but you have never been able to recognize the national existence and national rights of the Russians. . . . You need your [espousal of] “free self-determination” as a means to fighting for your political and social ideals, for abstract equality and freedom, but in no way for [a people’s] concrete national existence or for its national revival.³²

As this quote shows, Berdyaev was one of the very few Russian philosophers who had a positive attitude towards the Jews. He demonstrated sympathy for the Jews and their difficult situation in the Russian exile. He writes of the inadmissibility of solving the Jewish question by assimilation, by estranging the Jews from their national characteristics and traditions:

Do you [Russian people] have a feeling for the Jewish people, a people that goes back to the ancient roots of humanity? No! Your fight for the Jews does not care to know the Jews themselves, does not recognize the existence of what is essentially Jewish. . . . I feel deeply for the Jews and their Jewishness, for all the specificity and originality of the Jewish fate, for all their exclusivity and invincibility. Thus, my feeling becomes sympathy. I do not believe in an equalizing and assimilatory solution to the Jewish question. The mystery of any national existence deserves sympathy.³³

31 Ibid., 163–164.

32 Berdiaev, *Filosofia neravenstva*, 72.

33 Ibid.

4.11. Ways of National Revival

Chaadayev also speaks of the need for the Russian people to recognise its historical mission and destiny: “The day will come when we [Russians] will become an intellectual concentrate of Europe . . . and our future power, based on reason, will exceed our present power, which relies on material power.”³⁴ He continues in this vein:

This nation’s history [the history of the Russian people] will begin only on the day when this nation becomes conscious of the idea which was entrusted to it, which it is called upon to realize, and when it sets about to follow it with that enduring though hidden which leads nations to their destinies.³⁵

Chaadayev also relates in his other writings to the global historical mission of the Russian people. The accomplishment of the nation’s mission was, in his opinion, the key to its revival:

Russia, if it will only recognize its destiny, should take the initiative to promote all great-souled ideas since it is not attracted by the passions, ideas, or interests of Europe. . . . Russia is too grand to merely conduct a national policy: its task in the world is to promote a policy [to benefit the whole] human race. . . . Providence created us too strong to be egoistical. It raised us beyond the interests of nationalities and bade us pursue the interests of humanity; . . . that way lies our future, our progress.³⁶

It should be mentioned that the need for the Russian people to determine their historical mission is probably one of the most persistent issues in Russian

34 P. Ia. Chaadayev, “Pis’mo A. I. Turgenevu,” in his *Filosoficheskie pis’ma. Sbornik* (Moscow: Direkt-Media, 2016), 485. There is no translation of this fragment in either volume of translations from the collected writings of Chaadayev.

35 Chaadayev, *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, 169; Chaadayev, “The Apologia of a Madman,” 205–206; Chaadaev, “Apologiia sumashedshego,” 539.

36 Chaadayev, “Pis’mo A. I. Turgenevu,” 480. There is no translation of this fragment in either volume of translations from the collected writings of Chaadayev. See also A. F. Zamaleev, “Tri lika Rossii,” in *Rossii glazami russkogo. Chaadaev, Leont’ev, Solov’ev*, ed. and intro. A. F. Zamaleev (St. Petersburg: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1991), 7–8; Z. A. Kamenskii, “Paradoksy Chaadaeva,” in P. Ia. Chaadaev, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis’ma*, ed. Z. A. Kamenskii (Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1991), vol. 1, 9–14.

philosophy. Even a much later Russian philosopher and poet, Vyacheslav Ivanov, continues to contemplate possible forms of Russian national self-determination. He writes: “[At the turn of the century] we began an internal process, the true meaning of which consisted in efforts toward self-determination.”³⁷ Unlike the Russian thinkers, who were mainly concerned with the Russian people’s need for self-determination and the fulfillment of its global mission, Pinsker mainly speaks of the Jewish people’s need for national revival. He calls on the Jews to have an awareness of their history, which is a history of persecution, as a result of which they need a country of their own:

Since the national aspirations of some peoples who have revived before our very eyes has had some internal justification, then might not the question of the right of Jews to a revival also arise? . . . The Jews have their own past, the history of their common origin, a persistent life-force, unwavering faith, and an unequalled martyrology. And, more than any other nation this people was sinned against by all other peoples. Is all this not sufficient for them [the Jews] to be considered deserving and worthy of having their own homeland?³⁸

Pinsker particularly insists that the Jews must stop waiting for the Messiah to come in order to obtain their national homeland. Only a national homeland for the Jews would make possible the rebirth and self-determination of the Jewish people:

If we are truly concerned with a real refuge in order to put an end to our eternal wandering and to raise our nation both in our own and in others’ eyes, then first of all we should not dream of restoring ancient Judea. . . . The object of our striving should be not a holy land but one of our own. We need only a strip of land for our poor brothers, one which will be our own, from which no foreign ruler would be able drive us.³⁹

37 Vyacheslav Ivanov, “O russkoi idee,” in his *Rodnoe i vselenskoe* (Moscow: Respublika, 1994), 361–362.

38 Pinsker, “Avtoemansipatsiia,” 168.

39 Ibid., 171–172.

4.12. Conclusion: The Worldview of Chaadayev, Khomiakov, and the Slavophiles Versus that of Pinsker

As Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky⁴⁰ wrote in his article about Chaadayev, the Russians were mainly concerned with developing their national consciousness as a means to restore their authentical spiritual values: “In the ’30s and ’40s [of the nineteenth century] the main item on the agenda of the [Russian] intelligentsia was the elaboration of a national, rather than a social, consciousness.”⁴¹ The future image of Russia and the true expression of its ideals were a topic of much discussion in the nineteenth century.

Chaadayev and the Slavophiles⁴² believed that Russia suffered spiritually from the colonial dependence on Europe that had begun with Peter I. The Slavophiles saw the solution in a rapid repeal of serfdom, to which they referred as “emancipation,” and a return to pre-Petrine forms of Russian Orthodoxy. The Slavophiles believed that religion (in this case, Russian Orthodoxy) was the path to liberation for the Russians. Their worldview was mystical and religious in its essence.

The Westerners also believed that the repeal of serfdom was necessary, but their worldview was much more oriented towards social and judicial, rather than moral, issues. Serfdom was in their eyes, first and foremost, an unjust and archaic social practice that had to be abolished.

At the same time, Jewish thinkers, mostly Zionists, also searched to determine the image and status of their nation. The public discourse in Jewish society as we see it in the writings of Pinsker was very concerned with Jewish national mission and the ways of national revival as a means to be freed of exile and to restore the Jewish people as an independent national entity.

Unlike the Russian Slavophiles, the Jewish thinkers believed that excessive religiosity would obstruct the emancipation of the Jews. And yet, like Slavophiles and like Chaadayev, they believed in the special character of the Jewish people and advocated making efforts to preserve it.

40 Dmitry Nikolayevich Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky (1853–1920) was a Russian publicist, philosopher, and researcher.

41 D. N. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, “Psikhologiya russkoi intelligentsii,” in his *Sobranie sochinenii v devyati tomakh* (St. Petersburg: Goslitizdat, 1923–1924), vol. 5, 38.

42 In regard to the contradictions between the philosophy of Chaadayev and that of the Slavophiles see Gurevich-Lishchiner, *P. Ia. Chaadaev v kul'ture dvukh vekov*, 40–49 and 213–220.

Part II: Russian Ideational Influences as Expressed in
Hebrew Literary Works

Chapter 5: The Russian Theological Novel and Its Ideological Incarnation in Hebrew Literature

The present chapter is concerned with the Russian theological novel and its incarnation in modern Hebrew literature as the novel dealing with ideological issues. I wish to assert, and to bring proof, that within the realm of Hebrew culture, which is deeply rooted in the Jewish tradition, there is no place for the theological novel. Instead, there developed the ideological novel, which was vigorous and widely accepted.

5.1. The Primary Genres of the Novel in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Russian Literature

There exist several approaches to the study of the Russian novel in the nineteenth and early twentieth century and to the subcategories within the novel, each based upon a different criterion, such as: composition, the figure of the narrator, the fashioning of the dimensions of space and time, stylistic language, the type of narrative, and so forth. For the purpose of this study, I will focus on thematic distinctions within the genre of novel, whose main types may be summarized as follows:

- a) novel of character, devoted to shaping the figure of the hero or anti-hero, such as Mikhail Lermontov's (1814–1841) *A Hero of Our Time*;
- b) novel of social breadth, such as Aleksandr Radishchev's (1749–1802) *The Journey from Petersburg to Moscow*;
- c) period novel and bildungsroman: this category includes Leo Tolstoy's (1828–1910) *Childhood, Boyhood, Youth*;¹
- d) theological novel: this group includes the novels by Dostoyevsky (1800–1862) and by Leo Tolstoy, in which there is considerable material that is partly belletristic and partly moral and theological;²
- e) monologue-associative novel, known in literary studies of the

1 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* (Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979), 188–198.

2 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo* (Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1979), 89–115.

twentieth century as “stream of consciousness,” such as *My Golden Mother-in-Law* by Yury Nagibin (1920–1994);

f) ideological novel, a category that includes Nikolai Chernyshevsky’s (1828–1889) *What Is to be Done?* and Mikhail Sholokhov’s (1905–1984) *And Quiet Flows the Don*.³

Many novels combine elements from several different subcategories. For example, some novels have realistic, surrealistic, existential, allegoric, or symbolic features, which may in turn be combined with elements of humor, satire, and parody, as in the novel *The Master and Margarita* by Mikhail Bulgakov (1891–1940).⁴

5.2. The Theological Novel in Russian Literature of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

The theological novel developed in Russia⁵ during the second half of the nineteenth and the early decades of the twentieth century. This type of novel lies in the border area between theoretical inquiry and belles-lettres, with an orientation towards the latter.⁶ It is thus a form of belles-lettres or literature that incorporates theological elements.⁷

Belles-lettres, on the one hand, and theology, on the other, relate to various phenomena in reality each in their own way, each of them giving an interpretation and value consistent with its own approach.⁸ The theological

3 On the connection between ideology and the literature in Russian culture and society, see Lev Trotskii, *Literatura i revoliutsiia* (Moscow: Politizdat, 1991).

4 Cf. Bernstein’s classification of kinds of literary novels and their connection to philosophy: J. M. Bernstein, *The Philosophy of the Novel: Lukacs, Marxism and the Dialectics of Form* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 44–49. See also Camille Dumoulié, *Literature et philosophie. Le gai de la littérature* (Paris: Armand Colin, 2002), 45–55; Robert Smadja, “Roman et représentation littéraire,” in his *Introduction à la philosophie de la littérature: La littérature dans les limites de la simple raison* (Paris: Honore Champion Editeur, 2009), 211–215.

5 Compare Joseph Gerald Brennan, *Three Philosophical Novelists: James Joyce, Andre Gide, Thomas Mann* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1964), xi–xiv.

6 On philosophical enquiry in the novel beginning from the eighteenth century, see Patrick Colm Hogan, *Philosophical Approaches to the Study of Literature* (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2000), 44ff.

7 A. A. Ereemeev, “O kontseptsii ‘filosofskaia proza,’” *Voprosy literatury* 55, no. 1 (1990): 84–91.

8 Dumoulié, *Literature et philosophie*, 58–64. See also, concerning the mutual connections between philosophy and literature, Martin Warner, “Philosophy and Literature: Yesterday,

novel is an intermediate form between the two, which is primarily characterized by the attempt to describe various phenomena in a manner that penetrates to its nature and essence—an element common both to theology and to belles-lettres. It is likewise characterized by an attitude towards life as an inexhaustible source of primary data providing material for thought, whether in a philosophical or literary way.⁹

The theological novel, by its very nature, raises basic, comprehensive questions, such as the existence of God and of Divine providence and the nature and justice of God, as well as issues of an existential nature, such as the meaning of human life and the character of man's relation to God. This type of novel is concerned with questions relating to the religious establishment, to the value and necessity of moral issues, the nature of human freedom, man's relationship to life and death, to love, to reality, and to other people. The theological novel may also compare and evaluate various religions, their gods, choose the best one, and examine the role and function of the individual in the context of those religions. Well-known examples of theological novels are Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, *The False Coupon*, and *Father Sergei*; Dostoyevsky's *Crime and Punishment* and *The Brothers Karamazov*,¹⁰ and novels concerned with anarchistic or dualistic approach to God, such as Dostoyevsky's *The Devils* and *The Youngster*, or Bulgakov's *The White Guard* and *Master and Margarita*. For example, in *The Brothers Karamazov*, Dostoyevsky claims that God is mean, unjust, evil, but the human race and the world cannot survive without Him. If God were eliminated, the entire world would fall apart and life on earth would become unbearable. Moreover, Dostoyevsky argues that there would be no life on earth if God were exterminated by man.

The purpose of the theological novel is to focus attention upon various phenomena in life and to attain knowledge and understanding thereof. It has a theoretical nature, and the solution to the problems discussed therein is intended to assist the readers in choosing their own spiritual path and in forming their own worldview. This kind of novel may include moral exhortations and a tendency to seek the ethical value of things, to the extent of lending a didactic

Today and Tomorrow," *Ratio: An International Journal of Analytic Philosophy* 22, no. 4 (2009): special issue *Philosophy of Literature*, edited by Severin Schroeder, 486–507.

9 Antoine Compagnon, *Literature, Theory, and Common Sense* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), trans. Carol Cosman, 19–21.

10 See Peter Jones, *Philosophy and the Novel: Philosophical Aspects of "Middlemarch", "Anna Karenina", "The Brothers Karamazov", "A la recherche du temps perdu" and of the Methods of Criticism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), 115–142; Evgenia Cherkasova, *Dostoevsky and Kant: Dialogues on Ethics*, foreword by George L. Kline (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009).

character to the work. In such a novel there is hardly any room for humor, farce, or self-irony on the part of the author, as this would detract from the moral power and didactic nature of the work. In some cases the theological novel presents didactic passages through the use of direct and clearly stated formulae, as against the general tendency of belles-lettres to use imagery to present its ideas. However, the theological novel is also—and perhaps foremost—a work of belles-lettres, and its philosophical elements are incorporated within its overall literary framework.¹¹

The theological novel articulates an all-encompassing worldview; it constitutes a complete and well-organized system unto itself. Everything portrayed therein serves as proof and further demonstration of the correctness of the view presented by the author, functioning as a component within the author's theological teaching. The literary elements serve the same goal, which is primarily philosophical. This is true to such an extent that, even though the novel may indeed be viewed as belletristic, at times the presentation of its religious and ethical thesis nevertheless takes precedence over the poetics required by belles-lettres. Hence, in a novel of this type the protagonists often serve as mere mouthpieces for the author's worldview.¹²

In many cases the theological novel is based upon a realistic, factual event, and the work of the author consists in its presentation, explanation, and interpretation. The speculative value of the author's thought is of primary importance in the theological novel. Within its limits the author takes the opportunity to display his talents in the interpretation of the events portrayed, whereas the sensual, entertainment, or aesthetic value of the novel is of secondary importance. The theological novel tends toward realism, with great importance attached to the spiritual value of things as opposed to their superficial value.

The theological novel employs certain literary techniques consistent with its ideational character. Examples of this are the "texts within the text"—that is, letters, diaries, essays, lectures, or literary works of the protagonists in which they express their world view in a coherent and well-formulated manner, thereby assisting the author to convey the message.

During the course of the novel the authors may express their opinions by any means they choose, such as the content, structure, and composition of the work. But, regardless of the technique used, the novel constitutes a complete system unto itself, characterized by inner unity, and indirectly expresses the

11 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Voprosy literatury i estetiki* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1975), 37–39.

12 Jones, *Philosophy and the Novel*, 180–206.

author's worldview. For example, Bakhtin notes the multiplicity of tendencies in Dostoyevsky's novels *Crime and Punishment* and *The Brothers Karamazov*, which contain many theological aspects: his characters perform acts that entail internal contradictions, and their thoughts, impulses, and way of life are inconsistent with one another. They are torn by severe inner conflicts, turning from one extreme act to another of an opposite nature, thereby being unfaithful to themselves. Every such figure speaks with a number of incongruous voices that constantly change and contradict one another.¹³ Thus, the figure of Raskolnikov in *Crime and Punishment* combines a Napoleonic figure, product of his fevered imagination, with characteristics of the Messiah, the saints, Jesus, and God—and all these alongside Judas Iscariot, the contemptible traitor, murderer, Satan, and man of the underworld. Raskolnikov is simultaneously the criminal, the victim, the investigator, and the judge of his own crime. He is torn between rational, emotional, and impulsive approaches; he is emotionally tortured and seeks his path in life. But all these aspects and tendencies may be explained in light of the profound and solid theological background of the novel. The fashioning of a figure such as Raskolnikov, as well as that of other characters in the novel, represents the complexity and chaos of reality, the existential dilemmas confronted therein, and the theoretical philosophical questions that need to be clarified. But, despite all the contradictions, in the end Raskolnikov's figure serves as a means of expressing the author's existential worldview.

The same holds true for the shaping of the plots in *Crime and Punishment* and *The Brothers Karamazov*. The large number of seemingly unnecessary and unrelated subplots reflects the complex nature of human existence. The mixture of all these varied ideational and belletristic components reflects the author's philosophic thesis and, in the final analysis, enables him to arrive at a unified and well-formulated wholeness, expressing Dostoyevsky's existential view concerning man's degree of mastery over his life and the life of those surrounding him, the proper attitude towards the gap between man's natural faith and the accepted institutions of religion, and other questions of ethical import.

It is the nature of the theological novel to attempt to reflect the spiritual side of life in all its complexity, contradictions, continuity and chaos—but simultaneously these are meant to be consistent within the framework of a single harmonious system, complete unto itself. The absurd, the paradoxical, the wild, the senseless, and the illogical in life all find expression in the theological novel, but all these are crafted to present the reader with a specific, integrated philosophical viewpoint.

13 Bakhtin, *Problemy*, 32–52.

5.3. The Theological Novel in Comparison to the Ideological Novel in Hebrew Literature

In modern Hebrew literature, the patterns of Russian theological novel were transformed and devolved into the ideological novel. There were two reasons for this development. The first one is historical: the Hebrew novel was born and developed approximately at the same time as Jewish nationalism, and was a part of that new trend. Therefore, the ideological novel was natural for this literature in that time.¹⁴ The second reason is Jewish-religious: from its origins in the late nineteenth century until the period of the Holocaust, the Hebrew novel hardly ever asked questions of theological or existential character, such as those concerning the existence, nature, or substance of God. Such questions lay outside the boundaries of Hebrew literature, as the answers to them had been given by the Jewish religion long before the birth and formation of secular Hebrew literature. Within the milieu of Jewish culture there was no room for such questions, as traditional religious literature had already dealt and was dealing with them. Moreover, the latter provided far superior and more detailed, convincing, and authoritative answers, the like of which secular literature was unable to give. Hence, the level of discussion of theological issues in religious and secular literature was hardly comparable, religious literature enjoying the advantage.

In addition, the status of secular literature within Jewish culture was not as secure or self-evident as it was in other cultures—particularly in comparison with Russian literature, which in its own way was the main bearer of the theological novel. Thus, during the nineteenth and early twentieth century, Russian literature was regarded within the Russian cultural orbit as a kind of guide to the general public, and its authors were tantamount to prophets. By contrast, the authors of secular Hebrew literature were seen in traditional religious Jewish society, which constituted the majority of the Jewish public, as engaged in a kind of taboo activity. Not only was secular writing viewed as a kind of heresy, but even the reading of secular literature was frowned upon. When Russian authors said certain things regarding religious matters, their opinions were perceived, not only as deserving of attention, but at times as the words of authoritative spiritual teachers. By contrast, were the authors of secular Hebrew literature to have engaged in discussion of similar issues, their words would have been perceived as contemptuous, infuriating, and unnecessary, and

14 Anita Shapira, "Hebrew Literature and the Creation of the Zionist Narrative," in *Polish and Hebrew Literature and National Identity*, ed. Alina Moliak and Shoshana Ronen (Warsaw: Elipsa, 2010), 19–26.

would have been likely to elicit an opposite reaction to that desired.¹⁵ As a result, authors of secular Hebrew literature could only assume the position permitted them within Jewish culture—namely, that of teachers of ideology, as against that of teachers of theology.

Similar to those Jewish groups that had abandoned the religious way of life and had begun to concern themselves with secular ideological questions, literature was prevented from dealing with those issues that were perceived as the domain of religion. Instead—as it were, by default—Jewish literature concerned itself with ideological questions. The secularized Jewish groups created various ideological doctrines, organizations, and parties, which were in turn reflected in literature by the secular authors who emerged from their midst. Altogether, the Jewish novel dealt with more pragmatic and strategic issues, such as the quest for a national and political path.

There were thus only a very small number of unsuccessful attempts to create theological novels in Hebrew literature. Instead, there emerged the ideological novel, not long after the birth of the Russian theological novel, and to a large extent in imitation thereof.

5.4. The Theological Novella in Hebrew Literature: Chayyim Hazaz's *Shemuel Frankfurter*

One of the leading authors who attempted to create a theological novel in Hebrew literature was the Ukrainian-born Hebrew writer Chayyim Hazaz (1898–1973). Hazaz's *Shemuel Frankfurter*¹⁶ would appear to be the only theological novel in modern Hebrew literature. It portrays events occurring in a Yiddish-speaking Jewish village, or shteitl, in Western Russia and the life of its protagonist, for whom the novel is named. The plot develops during the early 1920s, at the height of the Civil War between the White Army—that is, those forces that sought to restore the former Czarist empire—and those of the Red Army, that is, the revolutionary communist fighters, who were eventually victorious and established the rule of communism in Russia, which prevailed for the next seventy years. Both armies, the anti-Bolshevik White Army and the Bolshevik

15 See the chapters on Leo Tolstoy's influence on Chayyim Hazaz in my book: Rina Lapidus, *Between Snow and Desert Heat: Russian Influences on Hebrew Literature, 1870–1970* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2003), 111–133, 134–154. See also my article concerning more Russian influences on Hazaz: Rina Lapidus, “‘Pirkei ha-mahapekha’ le-Hazaz ke-parodia le-sifrut ha-ide’ologit ha-sovyetit,” *Bikoret u-Parshanut* 33 (1998): 49–59.

16 The first version of *Shemuel Frankfurter* was published in the journal *Ha-tekufa* in 1924. The final version was published posthumously in 1980 in his collection of short novels *Chapters of the revolution* (*Pirkei ha-mahafekha*).

Red Army, attacked the Jews in unrestrained fashion, destroying community after community.¹⁷

The novella's protagonist, Shemuel Frankfurter, a Jewish intellectual of broad erudition and unique spiritual vision, arrives at the conclusion that neither Judaism nor communism are able to bring about the redemption for which man hopes. Presumably, these conclusions reflect the author's own disappointment with traditional Judaism and communism. He was familiar with the former, having been raised and educated in a traditional Jewish environment, and had experience with communism from his life in the nascent Soviet Union. Shemuel Frankfurter attempts to create a new type of religion combining elements taken from various conceptions: traditional Judaism, early Christianity, and Tolstoyism.¹⁸ He is unwilling to give up Judaism and sees himself as a Jew in every sinew of his being, but simultaneously he finds in early Christianity and in Tolstoyism values that he does not see in Judaism, but which became of crucial importance in his eyes. These include refraining from violence in opposition to evil, self-sacrifice for one's fellow or for the sake of ideals, and martyrdom. The practice of Judaism is likewise seen by Frankfurter as deficient: it is too permissive and ought to be stricter and more demanding. For example, he wishes to introduce certain ascetic or monastic practices, such as refraining from relations with women, from eating the flesh of living creatures, from drinking alcohol, and from shaving or cutting one's hair. Life based upon the laws of nature, love of one's fellow, sacrifice for the sake of other people, turning the other cheek—these are the basic elements of the new religion created by Shemuel Frankfurter. He sees himself not only as the founder of a new religion, which shall in the future lead mankind to redemption, but also as a saint and a true messiah. Frankfurter himself, and those around him, begin to be convinced that the New Testament prophecies regarding the messiah

17 The Civil War in Russia (1917–1922/1923) was a series of armed conflicts between various political, national, and social groups that took place on the territories of the former Russian Empire after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. According to historian Oleg Budnitsky, in Ukraine alone between 1920 and 1921 over 1,500 pogroms took place in 1,300 locations, 200,000 Jews were killed, and the same number was wounded and disabled. Oleg Budnitskii, *Rossiiskie evrei mezhduraznitsy i belymi* (Moscow: Rossiiskaia politicheskaiia entsiklopediia, 2005), 7, note 2.

18 Tolstoyism was a utopian religious trend prevalent in Russia during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It emerged during the 1880s under the influence of Leo Tolstoy's religious and philosophical doctrine. The Tolstoyans believed that society could be changed through individual religious and moral self-perfection; they advocated universal love and passive nonresistance to evil. However, Tolstoyism did not have a noticeable influence in Russia, and as a result of the revolutionary movement in 1917, it was outdated by the early twentieth century. See N. K. Gudzi, *Lev Tolstoi. Kritiko-biograficheskii ocherk* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1960).

refer to himself. For them, it is the decisive proof that his religion is true and that its source is from God Himself.

Shemuel Frankfurter gathers a group of adherents of his new teaching in order to spread it among the people and thereby bring about the perfection of the world and create an ideal utopian society upon the earth. However, this plan is foiled by the external circumstances—the Russian Civil War and the pogroms against the Jews which come in its wake. Russia is torn among different groups, conflicting with one another, filled with mutual hatred and thirsty for blood. The only common element among them is their eternal hatred of the Jews and their intense desire to harm them.

The novella has two endings, both of them tragic. In one version, Shemuel Frankfurter becomes the manager of an orphanage in the Jewish village, whose previous director and staff had abandoned it when the White Army drew close to the area, which had previously been under the control of the Red Army. When soldiers of the White Army enter the village, they slaughter all of its inhabitants suspecting that they had previously assisted the Red Army. They do not even take pity upon the children in the orphanage and slaughter them together with Shemuel Frankfurter. In the second version, all trace of Shemuel Frankfurter simply disappears during the course of the fighting between the Red Army and the White Army.

The novella presents a new, pacifistic religious platform, which promises its followers the revelation of the true God, drawing close to his messiah, spiritual elevation, and salvation from the sufferings of the world. In this novella Hazaz departs in a radical way from traditional Judaism in the direction of early Christianity and the religious teachings of Tolstoy, who is mentioned in the book numerous times, by name and by his religious pseudonyms.

Shemuel Frankfurter was not well received by the Jewish readership, who found it strange and alien, nor did it receive other reactions. It was ignored by reviewers and academics alike—apart from my papers and books, I know of no other scholarly treatment of this novella.¹⁹ The novella had no sequel, either literary or ideological.

5.5. The Ideological Elements in Hebrew Prose of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century

Unlike the theological novel, the ideological novel was not alien to modern Hebrew literature in the early stages of its development, nor can one assert that its birth derived from the absorption of Russian influences alone. As early as

19 See Lapidus, *Between Snow and Desert Heat*, 111–133.

the second half of the nineteenth century, during the Haskalah era, Hebrew authors incorporated fragments of ideological character within their literary texts, using various ways and methods. These included introductions and prefaces on the part of the author, placed at the beginning of the novel or at the beginning of some chapters. This practice was particularly characteristic of the Haskalah novels with their didactic tendency, and appears in several novels of Russian-born Hebrew writers, such as Abraham Mapu (1808–1867) and Peretz Smolenskin (1842–1885), and those of the Lithuanian-born Hebrew novelist Reuven Asher Broides (1852–1902).²⁰ At other times, ideological textual fragments are incorporated within the novel as autonomous rhetorical units within the discourse conducted among the various protagonists, or are brought within the fabric of the text in the form of thoughts or impressions found in the diary of a character, written in privacy.

As is clear from these examples, the techniques for incorporation of ideological components within the narrative process are different and varied, and fulfill additional functions beyond that of expressing ideas. Integrated fragments of this type appear, in a later period, in the novels of Russian-born Hebrew writer Yosef Chayyim Brenner (1881–1921), who was clearly subject to the influence of the nineteenth-century Russian novel, with its particular forms and ideational tendencies, such as those of the prominent Russian authors Leo Tolstoy²¹ and Fyodor Dostoyevsky.²² Brenner admired the philosophical and theological works of Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, praised them, and made translations from their works.²³ Under the influence of these two Russian spiritual giants, Brenner also wrote works dealing with the world of ideas, but

20 On the beginning of the development of the ideological issues, see Robert Alter, *The Invention of Hebrew Prose: Modern Fiction and the Language of Realism* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), 71–72.

21 See Rina Lapidus, “‘Ba’al ha-bait ve-ha-poel’ me-et L. N. Tolstoy be-targumo ha-yivri shel Y. Ch. Brenner,” in *Misaviv la-nekuda: Mechkarim chadashim ‘al M. Y. Berdichevsky, Y. Ch. Brenner, A. D. Gordon*, ed. Avner Holtzman, Gideon Katz, and Shalom Ratzabi (Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev, 2008), 187–209.

22 See the chapter concerning the Russian influences on Brenner in my book: Lapidus, *Between Snow and Desert Heat*, 10–25; and my articles: Rina Lapidus, “‘Al liv’yatan ve-shor ha-bar—bein Brenner le-Dostoevski,” *Moznayim* 59, nos. 1–2 (1985): 31–34; Rina Lapidus, “Mussagim ve-tavniyot: Ha-lashon ha-rusit be-‘Misaviv la-nekuda’ le-Y. Ch. Brenner,” in *Nekudot mifne ba-sifrut ha-yivrit ve-zikatan la-mega’yim im sifrutot acherot*, ed. Z. Shamir and A. Holzmann (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1993), 157–165.

23 See Lapidus, *Between Snow and Desert Heat*, 10–25; idem, “Dostoyevsky be-levush yuhaduti—‘Ha-chet ve-onsho’ ba-targumo shel Y. Ch. Brenner,” *Jerusalem Studies in Hebrew Literature* 14 (1993): 275–291; idem, “‘Ba’al ha-bait ve-ha-poel’ me-et Lev Nikolaevich Tolstoy ba-targumo ha-yivri shel Yosef Chaim Brenner.”

instead of incorporating theological elements like Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy, he worked with ideological elements.

Brenner utilized the integration of ideological elements by means of polemical dialogue. In his novel *Around the Dot*, the ideological aspect is expressed in the heated discussion between Yaakov Abramson, the figure with whom the author identifies himself, and his lady friend Havah. Yaakov chooses the Hebrew language for his journalistic essays, which he writes with great enthusiasm. But Jewish nationalism and the Hebrew language are alien to Havah, and she openly prefers the use of the Russian language. This debate between divergent views also has clear implications for the personal relations between the two.²⁴

In Brenner's later novel, *From Here and There* (1911), written in Palestine during the period of the Second Aliyah (ca. 1905), ideological elements are incorporated in a completely different manner: namely, as discussions and thoughts concerning the Zionist vision and the possibilities of its realization in the nascent Jewish community in pre-state Palestine.²⁵ Here, too, these textual units appear in the form of a debate among the protagonists who are thrown together while waiting for the opening of a library in Jerusalem, as well as in the forms of documentary expression chosen by Brenner.²⁶ In addition, in *From Here and There* Brenner uses also a multi-generic form: he includes letters, reports, and even quotations from articles concerning concrete questions relating to settlement in the country. As against the integration of ideas by psychological and dialogic means, here Brenner uses the documentary method, which serves as the dominant elements within the novel.

There are no theological aspects whatsoever in these novels by Brenner. Instead, ideological ideas are incorporated by the author by means of various literary techniques.

5.6. The Tendency to Replace Theological Motifs with Ideological Motifs in Hebrew Poetry

The replacement of theological elements, common to Russian literature, by ideological elements is found in Hebrew poetry as well as in novels. The Russian

24 Yossef Chayyim Brenner, *Misaviv la-nekuda*, in his *Kol ktavav* (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad, 1960–1978), vol. 1, 469–473.

25 Yossef Chayyim Brenner, *Mi-kan u-mi-kan. Shesh machberot u-miluyim* (Warsaw: Sifrut, 1911).

26 Yossef Chayyim Brenner, *Kol ktavav* (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad, 1960–1978), vol. 2, 1293–1294, 1321–1322, 1344–1346, 1375–1378, 1430–1436.

poets wrote poems with theological themes such as a discussion of the nature of God, the relationship of God and the believer, the relationship of man to God, or the value of human life in the light of faith in God. Take, for example, Mikhail Lermontov's famous poem, "I Come out to the Path Alone,"²⁷ which has become one of the most vivid reflections of Russian poetry and its nature.²⁸ In this text, the speaker describes going out on a quiet and misty night, gazing at the vast sky and twinkling stars, and imagining that the whole world is turning towards God. When he contemplates the beauty of that night, he is inebriated by the magnificence of God's creations and his desire to live and to feel comes back to him with redoubled force. The encounter with the tranquil and ancient power of nature represents for him a meeting with God and gives him a feeling of calm, satisfaction, and oblivion. His encounter with God is like a meeting with a reassuring father who spreads his protection over the speaker. Lermontov also described a genuine religious experience in the poem "When the Yellow Field Flutters. . . ."²⁹ Here, the speaker is in a state of depression, plagued with suicidal thoughts,³⁰ but a contemplation of the comforting and spectacular scenes of nature convinces him of the existence of God. Faith in the Almighty calms him, his depression leaves him and he is happy:

Then the worry in my soul dies down,
And the wrinkles on my forehead disappear.
Then, I can find happiness on earth,
And I see God in the heavens . . .

-
- 27 Mikhail Lermontov, "I Come out to the Path . . .," trans. Yevgeny Bonver, https://www.poetryloverspage.com/poets/lermontov/i_come_out_to_path.html. For another translation, see Mikhail Lermontov, "I Go out on the Road Alone . . .," in *From the Ends to the Beginning: A Bilingual Anthology of Russian Poetry*, trans. Tatiana Tulchinsky, Andrew Wachtel, and Gwenan Wilbur, ed. Ilya Kutik and Andrew Wachtel.
- 28 About nature as a symbol of connection between a man and God in poetry by Lermontov see D. E. Maksimov, *Poeziia Lermontova*, ed. G. M. Friedlaender (Moscow: Nauka, 1964), 97–98.
- 29 Mikhail Lermontov, "When the Yellow Field Flutters . . .," trans. Opal Moon, <http://lyricstranslate.com/en/kogda-volnuetsya-zhelteyushchaya-niva>. For another translation, see Mikhail Lermontov, "When, in the Cornfield, Yellow Waves are Rising . . .," trans. Yevgeny Bonver, ed. Dmitry Karshtedt, https://www.poetryloverspage.com/poets/lermontov/when_in_corny_field.html.
- 30 R. R. Milner-Gullard, "'My Soul's Anxiety is Stilled . . .': An Analysis of Mikhail Lermontov's 'Kogda Volnuetsia Zhelteiushchaia Niva . . .,'" in *Mikhail Lermontov—Commemorative Essays*, ed. A. Briggs (Birmingham: Birmingham University Press, 1991), 79–88.

As we see in Lermontov's two poems, the speaker's emotional and psychological wellbeing depended on the recognition of the existence of a benevolent deity who protects the speaker. God is as an alter-ego of the speaker, and the relationship with Him is essential for the speaker's desire to live and be connected to reality.³¹ The relationship with God is the basis of the speaker's natural and physical existence.

Lermontov had great influence on Hebrew poetry as a whole,³² and he had a particularly deep, and even decisive influence, on the Hebrew national poet Chayyim Nachman Bialik.³³ However, Bialik refrained from writing poems about any aspect of God or about the poet's relationship to God. Instead, he wrote many poems dealing with questions of a national character relating to the Jewish people. He criticized the policies of the heads of the Jewish communities in Eastern Europe, the habitual behaviour of the Jews in the face of acts of antisemitism in the alien environment, and the tactics and strategies of Jewish life in the Russian Empire. He wrote poems like "In the City of Slaughter"³⁴ in which he bewailed the bitter fate of the Jews in the Kishinev pogroms in 1903. Bialik cried to the heavens about the conduct of the Jews in the pogroms and foretold an even worse and darker future for the Jewish people if it did not undergo a radical change from a state of passivity and acceptance to the honorable behavior of a nation ready to defend itself. Likewise, in his story "That which is Distorted Cannot Be Corrected,"³⁵ Bialik expressed a variety of negative emotions: shock, pain, grief, and recoilment, at the cowardly reaction of a Jew—an understanding and intelligent person, on the face of it—to a manifestation of violence towards him.

31 D. E. Maksimov, "O dvukh stikhotvoreniiakh Lermontova," in *Russkaia klassicheskaia literatura. Razbory i analizy*, ed. D. Ustiuzhin (Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1969), 127–147.

32 Zoya Kopelman, *Nokhechuto shel Mikael Lermontov ba-shira ha-yivrit, me-emitza' ha-mea ha-19 ve-ad yameinu* (PhD diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2003).

33 Esther Nathan, *Ha-poema "Metey midbar"—shorasheya ba-shira ha-rusit ve-ha-yivrit* (PhD diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1986); Esther Nathan, "Tchernichovski u-Vialik: Shirei ha-gevura ve-ha-koach ve-ziketam la-simbolizm ha-rusi," in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Judaic Studies* (Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1990), 151–158, repr. as an expanded version in *Tchernichovski: Mechkarim u-te'udot*, ed. Boaz Orfali (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1994), 199–216; Esther Nathan, *Ha-derekh le-"Metey midbar"—'al poema shel Bialik ve-ha-shira ha-rusit* (Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad, 1993).

34 Chayyim Nachman Bialik, "Ba-'yir ha-harega," in his *Ktavav*, vol. 1 (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1965), 350–360.

35 Chayyim Nachman Bialik, "Me'uvat lo yukhal litkon," in his *Ktavav*, vol. 2 (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1965), 175–179.

Only in one poem, “Alone—Wind Blew, Light Drew Them All,”³⁶ is there an oblique reference to the Divine Presence (Shekhina). Bialik wrote:

Wind blew,
light drew them all.
New songs revive their mornings.
Only I, small bird, am forsaken
under the Shekhina’s wing.

But also in this poem, Bialik was not, of course, referring to the Jewish God. In reality, he complains that the people around him followed the fashion and abandoned Jewish cultural affairs for more progressive things, and only he remained dedicated to his life’s mission of fostering Jewish culture. Even in this poem, the only one in all Bialik’s works that can be said to relate to something beyond the world of humanity, he refers not to God but to the world of Jewish culture.

5.7. The Ideological Novel in Russian and Hebrew Literatures during the First Half of the Twentieth Century

Towards the 1920s and thereafter, the popularity of the theological novel in Russian literature declined until it disappeared almost completely from the literary stage. The October Revolution in 1917, the emergence of socialist realism,³⁷ and the Second World War are the landmarks that explain this phenomenon.

The October Revolution of 1917 led to the emergence of atheistic thinkers and authors. A direct product of this transformation was socialist realism, a new mode of writing, which was proclaimed the official norm by Maxim Gorky³⁸ in 1932 on the pages of the periodical *Literaturnaia gazeta*.³⁹

36 Chayyim Nachman Bialik, “Levad—Kullam nasa ha-ruach, kullam sachaf ha-or,” in his *Ktavav* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1965), vol. 1, 141–142. English translation is from Chaim Nachman Bialik, “Alone,” <http://www.poetryinternationalweb.net/pi/site/poem/item/3345/auto/0/0/Chaim-Nachman-Bialik/ALONE>.

37 Socialist realism is a style of realistic art that developed and became officially approved in the Soviet Union for nearly seventy years. Socialist realism had as its purpose the furtherance of the goals of socialism and communism. It glorified the roles of the humble people and the working class.

38 Maxim Gorky was a pen name of Aleksei Maksimovich Peshkov (1868–1936), a Russian writer and political activist.

39 *Literaturnaia gazeta* (Literary newspaper) is a weekly cultural and political newspaper published in Russia and the Soviet Union.

This meant that, henceforth, by the decree of Stalin's government, all literary work must be ideologically weighted and convey a clear, unequivocal, and decisive communist message. The Second World War, which broke out a few years later, put a total halt to the theological novel in Russian literature. The physical destruction and psychological shock experienced by the population of the Soviet Union hindered their authors from dealing in their works with theoretical and hypothetical philosophical issues. Instead, the victory of the Soviet Red Army and Soviet people over the Nazis gave further weight to the communist ideological novel. This development contributed decisively to the flowering and strengthening of the ideological novel in Russian literature, and, through its influence, also contributed to the development of the ideological tendency in Hebrew literature.

During the first half of the twentieth century and particularly towards the mid-century mark, the ideological novel in Hebrew literature written in pre-state Palestine and in the first years of the State of Israel continued to develop and bloomed, assuming more sophisticated and advanced literary forms. No longer were the ideological textual units incorporated within the Hebrew novel by means of monologues, dialogues, or letters, as was the case during the late nineteenth century—a form that was excessively simple and schematic. Rather, from this point on the ideological messages were incorporated less artificially within the plot of the novel and in the fashioning of its characters.

During the 1960s and early 1970s the Hebrew ideological novel was still in its prime and major Hebrew authors worked in this area. Thus, Chayyim Hazaz, who had previously tried his hand at writing a theological novella, turned in the end to ideological prose. His novel *A Rushing River*⁴⁰ describes the cruel lot of a young Jewish communist Henikh, who sacrifices himself for the sake of the victory of the communist revolution in Russia but fails to benefit from this sacrifice. This novella portrays communism as a disappointing and deceitful illusion.

However, soon after reaching its peak, the Hebrew ideological novel began to show signs of waning. The weakening of the ideological novel's dominance is felt more strongly somewhat later, during the late 1970s and early 1980s. From that point on, the Hebrew ideological novel finds itself in a state of continuous decline, in its circulation and degree of acceptance.

40 The novel *A Rushing River* was first published in a shorter version under the title "From This and That" in the periodical *Ha-Tekufa*: Chayyim Hazaz, "Mi-zeh u-mi-zeh," *Ha-Tekufa* 21 (1924): 7–32. An expanded and revised version of the novel was later published as Chayyim Hazaz, "Nahar shotef," in his *Chagurat mazalot: Sippurim* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1970), 164–263, repr. in his *Asara sippurim* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1988), 11–111.

This tendency finds explicit expression from the end of the 1980s on with the appearance of *A Russian Novel* (in English translation, *The Blue Mountain*, 1989) by Israeli writer Meir Shalev (b. 1948).⁴¹ This novel is written as a parody of Zionist ideology, which is shown as being influenced by Russian communist ideology. It is told from the viewpoint of young Baruch Shinhar. His grandfather, Yaakov Mirkin, recounts the history of his family in mandatory Palestine, whence the father of the Mirkin family came from Russia during the early years of the twentieth century. At the beginning he worked at different farm jobs and later settled on his own plot of land, establishing a small agriculture village as a kind of realization of the classic Zionist myth.

This novel attacks the concepts and inner world of the Jewish settlers in Palestine as they were accepted in the social and political milieu of the 1950s and 1960s, when people continued for many decades after their immigration to live according to the ideas and standards that were accepted long ago in Russia. For example, as Shalev laments, they adopted the manner of the simple folk in Russia, who groveled before the aristocracy of the Russian royal court of two hundred years ago. This approach looks ridiculous against the background of the image of modern Zionist settlers, supposedly self-confident and proud new Jews, steeped in ideology. No less ridiculous in its exaggeration are the political debates between the old settler organizations, remembered more than half century after the dismantling of these organizations and the cessation of their activity.⁴²

In some cases the author's ridicule of the settlers assumes the particularly sardonic and penetrating form of macabre, black humor. For example, during a feast, the gossip surrounding the death of an old woman, which might have been natural or may have been "initiated," succeeds in spoiling the appetites. The behavior of the seemingly ideological, principled, and heroic settlers is revealed as pathetic and bordering on the criminal.⁴³ With this, the traditional fashioning of the ideological novel is presented in a mocking light: the ones heroic characters become pathetic, the perspective of the author is grotesquely slanted, the plot is filled not with celebrations, but with horrors and mysteries, and the life of the settlers gives rise to an entertaining farce.

As in many other cases in the history of literature, the end of the period of dominance of a given literary trend finds expression in the emergence of parodies thereof. The destiny of the Hebrew ideological novel was no different: its death was heralded by a novel that parodied it. As is the way of satire and

41 Meir Shalev, *Roman rusi* (Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1989).

42 Ibid., 204–205.

43 Ibid., 202.

parody, *A Russian Novel* makes no pretense of representing any doctrine; rather, its aim is to mock those against whom it is directed. Its goal is both the contents of the Hebrew ideological novel and its conventional stylistic forms. Shalev's text marks the end of the era of the Hebrew ideological novel.⁴⁴

5.8. Summary

The theological novel occupies a place of honor in the history of the Russian literature, reaching the peak of its development during the last quarter of the eighteenth and in the nineteenth century. The theological novel, by its nature, asks questions of a religious character, raises penetrating issues regarding the relations between man and God, asks about God himself, his character and his attributes, and clarifies whether one should believe in God at all and what sort of god should one believe in.

By contrast, the development of Jewish literature bypassed the stage of the theological novel, its place being taken by the ideological novel. The theological novel, which by its nature attempts to give answers to the questions raised by religion, was unable to survive within the parameters of the Jewish culture, as the position and function of religion within the Jewish cultural milieu were of supreme authority. It would be inconceivable for a Jewish author writing a Jewish novel to create a Jewish protagonist who believes in the principles of an alien religion or, alternatively, to establish a new religious sect that deviates from traditional Judaism. The Jewish reading public would be unable to identify with such a protagonist. The boundaries placed by the Jewish tradition on the Hebrew author and thus on the characters in Hebrew prose were quite narrow and restricted their freedom.

When Jewish authors wished to examine the accepted principles of Jewish theology or even to rebel against them, they might cease to observe the commandments of Judaism, but would not join another religious, faith, or philosophic group. To do so would make them apostates, negative and contemptible figures for their intended audience.

A Jewish author may be a God-fearing Jew to a greater or lesser extent. In any case, Jewish literature was only permitted to move within the orbit between observing the practice of Judaism and throwing off the yoke of the commandments. It could not stray from that orbit and invent or adopt another religion for its protagonists.

44 Cf. Robert Alter, "Magic Realism in the Israeli Novel," in *The Bloom in Contemporary Israeli Fiction*, ed. Alan Mintz (Hanover: Brandeis University Press, 1997), 25–28.

Within this limited range between Orthodox piety and a secular but Jewish approach, there was only room for ideological movements concerned with seeking the proper cultural, social, and political path, as opposed to the quest for a religious path, which was alien to Jewish literature and cultural milieu. Discussed instead were ideological questions concerning the interrelations among different Jewish cultures, such as the debate between Hebrew and Yiddish culture, the relation between the Jewry of Eretz Yisrael and that of the Diaspora, and so forth. All these factors led to the creation of the ideological novel in Jewish literature and prevented the birth and development of the Jewish theological novel in the Russian style, notwithstanding the fact that the Russian influence upon Jewish literature was decisive and all-encompassing.

True, during the second half of the twentieth century, particularly after the Holocaust, Jewish literature no longer heeded the severe and restrictive voice of the Jewish religion, and it often mocked that religion with bitter parodies. Nevertheless, it would appear that Jewish literature simultaneously despises the Jewish tradition and continues to respect the restrictions of Jewish propriety. To use the terminology of Harold Bloom,⁴⁵ between the secular Jewish literature of the second half of the twentieth century and the Jewish religion there is a kind of Freudian family relationship. Jewish literature hates the Jewish religion, which is its source and its great progenitor, but at the same time it is unable to detach itself.

45 Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

Chapter 6: The Epic Poem *Songs of Glory* by Naphtali Herz Wessely

Introduction: The Unintended Parody Effect Produced by the Mixture of Literary Depictions and Religious Pathos

Ideas from the world of Russian and European humanities and culture penetrated into the Jewish world in a great variety of fields, and I have already shown those influences above, in the field of ideology and religion. Obviously, those effects were not always absorbed with new changes from the Russian or European original. Rather, they were frequently adapted to the world of Jewish humanities and culture.

This chapter will deal with influences that Jewish humanities in general, and literature in particular, absorbed from the field of romanticism.¹ Romanticism originated in Europe, and especially in Germany, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, and from there it reached other countries, including Russia.² The influences in the field of romanticism reached the world of Jewish humanities both directly from Europe and through Russia.

Romanticism had a broad and weighty effect on literature—in fact, on all of the literatures of Europe and Russia.³ The first Hebrew poet who composed a literary work in the spirit of romanticism in the Hebrew literature was Naphtali Herz Wessely (1725–1805), who wrote a long epic poem entitled *Songs of Glory* (*Shirei Tif'eret*, 1802–1829). Wessely's poem appeared when romanticism was already common and well accepted in the literatures of Europe and Russia; compared to literary works in the spirit of romanticism in those literatures, *Songs of Glory* was relatively naïve and simplistic. In this chapter, I will compare *Songs of Glory* to works of this type in European and Russian literatures, in order to clarify its ideological and literary qualities.

1 Michael Ferber, *Romanticism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).

2 Ruediger Safranski, *Romanticism: A German Affair*, trans. Robert E. Goodwin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2014).

3 Michael O'Neill and Mark Sandy, eds., *Romanticism: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2006); Carmen Casaliggi, *Romanticism: A Literary and Cultural History* (New York: Routledge, 2016).

6.1. Generic Aspects of *Songs of Glory*

Songs of Glory by Naphtali Herz Wessely is the first Hebrew epic. It has been the subject of extensive interpretation in the historiography of Haskalah literature. Various aspects of this poem have been examined, such as its thematic relation to the Bible and Midrash, its ideological character, which is expressed, among other things, by a multitude of catchphrases common in Haskalah literature in its day, problems of the poetic meter employed by Wessely, and linguistic questions.⁴ Almost all the critics have also referred to the problem of external literary influences notable in *Songs of Glory*. Several scholars have noted the influence of Johann Gottfried von Herder's (1744–1833) *About the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry* (Vom Geiste der Hebräischen Poesie, 1783) on Wessely's book. Herder suggested that an epic on Moses and the Exodus from Egypt should be written by a Jewish poet.⁵ The historian Heinrich (Zvi) Graetz, in his monumental history of the Jews, spoke of the influence or inspiration of the epic *Messiad*, by the German poet Friedrich G. Klopstock (1724–1803)⁶ on Wessely.

The information regarding possible external influences and inspirations also affected evaluations of *Songs of Glory* in the historiography of the literature of the Hebrew enlightenment. Fishel Lachover⁷ treats *Songs of Glory* as a kind of epic that did not fulfill the requirements of the genre. Thus, he accepts the assumption of Herder's influence, especially in view of his suggestion that a Hebrew epic should be written about Moses and the Exodus from Egypt, but finds that Wessely does not fulfill the task. Lachover also finds a stylistic affinity between Wessely and Klopstock's epic, but points out the ideological distance between them. Unlike the *Messiad*, with its sentimental Christian religious tendency, Wessely's work, at least according to Lachover, is permeated by the spirit of the Haskalah. Indeed, Wessely distances himself from the style of the folk tale, "which is the soul of the epic," and explains several miraculous episodes in the Bible from a rationalistic point of view. He seldom takes flight on

4 See also on the traits and characteristics of the genre of traditional epic: John Miles Foley, *Traditional Epic. The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 8–19; Philip Hardie, *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

5 Johann Gottfried von Herder, *On the Spirit of Hebrew Poetry: A Guide for Those who Love It, and the Oldest Story of the Human Spirit* (Dessau: Buchhandlung der Gelehrten, 1782), vol. 2, 74–75.

6 See Klausner, *Ha-historia shel ha-sifrut ha-yivrit*, vol. 1, 119.

7 Fishel Yeruham Lachover, *Toldot ha-sifrut ha-yivrit ha-chadasha* (Tel Aviv: Devir, 1936), vol. 1, 71–72.

the wings of imagination, which ought to be spread wide in an epic work. At the same time, Lachover points out several lyrical effusions found in *Songs of Glory*.

In his book, published soon after Lachover's work, Joseph Klausner left no room for doubt regarding the influence of Herder on *Songs of Glory*, nor did he question the possibility that Wessely had Klopstock's *Messiade* in mind while writing his epic. In support of this contention, he points out that Wessely's autotranslation of *Songs of Glory* into German is titled *Messiade*, in imitation of the German poet.⁸

Chayyim Nachman Shapira argues against the assumptions of his predecessors regarding Wessely's connections with Klopstock's *Messiade*.⁹ First, Wessely himself does not allude at all to the influence of German literature. There is also an essential difference between Wessely, who was subject to the influence of rationalism, and Klopstock, who tended toward sentimental Christian religiosity and rejected classicism. His *Messiade* is essentially a collection of ecstatic hymns with no logical connection between them, and his descriptions are esoteric and allegorical. "There is no hint at all of all of these things in Wessely's work," argues Shapira, adding that form was the only thing in common between Wessely and Klopstock, as both of them wrote poetry on religious foundations.¹⁰ Shapira claims that, in contrast to the obscure elements of intense emotion and mystery that characterize the *Messiade*, *Songs of Glory* has a clear plan with absolute order and organized exposition. In Shapira's estimation, Wessely's work has a clear tendency toward restraint, and the lyric and sentimental elements are minor.

Avraham Shaanan, who was familiar with the views of Lachover, Klausner, and Shapira, offers distinctions of his own.¹¹ He sees *Songs of Glory* not as a combination of epic and lyric elements, but as an opposition between them. In view of several lyrical passages Shaanan does not deny the possibility that Wessely attempted, consciously or unconsciously, to imitate Klopstock's odes and hymns. Shaanan generally distinguishes between two basic tendencies in *Songs of Glory*, "one being closed to lyricism, and the other entirely an effort to expand upon the epic story that has already been told in the Bible itself with the restraint of genius."¹²

8 Klausner, *Ha-historia shel ha-sifrut ha-yivrit*, vol. 1, 119–120.

9 Chayyim Nachman Shapira, *Toldot ha-sifrut ha-yivrit he-chadasha* (Tel Aviv: Massadah, 1940), 216–217.

10 Ibid., 218, 227, 229, 231, 237.

11 Avraham Shaanan, *Ha-sifrut ha-yivrit he-chadasha li-zerameya* (Tel Aviv: Massadah, 1962–1977), vol. 1, 64–68, in particular: 66.

12 Ibid., 67.

Parallel to Shaanan's observations, Shimon Halkin, in lectures that were later published as *Currents and Forms in Modern Hebrew Literature* (Zramim ve-tzurot be-sifrut ha-yivrit he-chadasha), presented his views in original arguments regarding the generic contradictions found in *Songs of Glory*. He finds a collision between the author's desire to tell a story and the didactic urge in his work. The epic, he points out, is based on two principles. The first is detail. Wessely adds details that are not found in the Bible, the primary source upon which his work is built. Most of the details are invented by the poet. The second principle is explanation: the provision of explanations for understanding the connection between the facts and events and the characters of the work with respect to the psychological motivation of their feelings.

As Halkin explains, there is constant conflict between the desire to tell the story and the desire to describe the ideal figure of Moses, the protagonist of *Songs of Glory*. Authors of epics naturally tend to seize upon exalted figures and contrast their greatness to the ordinary and lowly characters with whom the ideal figure comes into conflict. Nevertheless, the traditional epic idealization is significantly different from Wessely's approach in *Songs of Glory*. "Accepted epic idealization is built upon the presentation of a multitude of actions, deeds, and events in the protagonist's life,"¹³ whereas Wessely presents his protagonist's thoughts in more detail than his actions, deeds, and events. Halkin finds in Wessely's poem too much expression of emotion and thought, which is meant to compensate for the lack of concrete action. The details that the poet adds here, "instead of building an epic story, are swallowed up and lost in reflective and emotional monologues." Halkin also notes that, unlike the practice in the epic genre, he displayed an egocentric attitude toward the figure of Moses. Halkin claims: "the author does not allow his hero to live in his own center, but he inserts himself centrally into the work."¹⁴ All of these traits, according to Halkin, who bases his remarks upon a representative textual analysis of one chapter of *Songs of Glory*, lead to significant diminution of its epic character.

Yehudit Barel offers a thorough study of the Hebrew long poem. In her book she refers to the influence of the epic genre, as established by Wessely, on the formation and development of the long poem in Hebrew literature in general, and on the beginnings of the long poem in Haskalah literature in particular. She ignores the doubts and challenges raised by her predecessors regarding the fulfillment of the essential principles of the epic in *Songs of Glory*.

13 Shimon Halkin, *Zeramim ve-tzurot ba-sifrut ha-yivrit ha-chadasha*, vol. 1: *Perakim be-sifrut ha-Haskalah ve-Chibbat Tzion*, ed. Tzipora Kagan (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1984), 110–111.

14 Ibid., 113.

In contrast, she states that this work “served as an ideal of Hebrew poetry in Hebrew literature, as an ideal of epic poetry, and also as a model for those who wrote in the genre of the long poem in following years.” At the same time, she is also aware that “the ideological-theological formula prevents the very possibility of concentrating on the imperfect human soul.”¹⁵

6.2. The Violation of Generic Rules in *Songs of Glory*

Analysis of *Songs of Glory* in the light of theoretical study of the epic genre shows that the contradictions between the crystallization of this poem and the common features of the epic genre are greater than were noted in earlier studies. They are expressed by the incorporation, in this work, of components of opposing and incompatible genres.¹⁶

The epic deals with a broad historical span of time in the history of a nation or large ethnic group.¹⁷ It recounts episodes in the history of that group and events in its life in a heroic, idealistic, or sentimental spirit, from an almost mythical and cosmic perspective, obscuring the figure of the author and observing other generic rules. The form of the epic is that of a long narrative poem, written in meter and often rhymed as well. From that point of view, Wessely has chosen the most appropriate form for expressing historical and national Jewish content. However, as noted, his work contains significant deviations from the epic form.

6.3. Plot in Epic and in *Songs of Glory*

The epic is usually based on historical events in the life of a people, and from that point of view *Songs of Glory* does not deviate from the norm. It reconstructs historical events with their constant vicissitudes, and it presents a variety of images in concrete and detailed fashion, with an effort to present visual images as much as possible.

Works of the epic genre are characterized by the unity of plot, with concentration on the main plot, the reduction of subplots and the limitation of their extent and importance within the work, while their connection with the main plot is strengthened. This, however, is not the case with *Songs of Glory*. Prominent here is actually the multiplicity of plots whose connections with one

15 Yehudit Barel, *Ha-Poema ha-ivrit me-hithhavuta ve-ad reshit ha-mea ha-esrim: mechkar be-toldot ha-zhanr* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1995), 17–18.

16 Cf. Reyes Bertolin Cebrian, *Comic Epic and Parodies of Epic: Literature for Youth and Children in Ancient Greece* (Zurich: George Olms Verlag Hildesheim, 2008), 1–5.

17 Mikhail Bakhtin, *Epos i roman* (St. Petersburg: Azbuka, 2000), 204.

another are weak and require explanation and interpretation. The main plot of *Songs of Glory* is devoted to the story of Moses and the Jewish people during the time of the Exodus from Egypt. However, the other plots, which are presented according to their order in the Bible, are only loosely connected to the main plot, and the connection between them is not self-evident.

Moreover, the episodes are presented in *Songs of Glory* in the order of their appearance in the Bible. Thus, the causal connection between them is not always understandable, nor is it explained according to belletristic criteria, which is the unity of the plot. The author's display of loyalty to the Bible is at the expense of following the rules of the epic, which results in an interrupted and fragmented, inchoate plot.¹⁸

6.4. The Depiction of the Protagonist in the Epic and in *Songs of Glory*

Descriptive scope and multiplicity of narrative are particular characteristics of the epic genre, examples of which are the splendid landscapes and the depiction of nature as perfect. Life is presented as harmonious, and the weather in nature is consistent with the situation of the positive protagonist.

The essence of the epic is the description of events in external reality, the description of the deeds and actions of the heroes, and, primarily, those of the protagonist. From this point of view there is some similarity between the epic and the adventure novel. However, whereas in the latter the plot is shaped dramatically, the epic plot displays the epic spirit. The protagonist does not act individualistically, nor are his goals personal. Rather, his action is meant for the general good, and is presented in broad scope, as universal or collective, making its mark on the future of the nation and bringing about its national redemption and its liberation from evil. There is a grandiose and general impetus in the presentation of things, sometimes verging on the apocalyptic, and the entire work is permeated with allegorical and symbolic overtones.¹⁹

Although Moses, the protagonist of *Songs of Glory*, generally acts in accordance with the above principle, at the same time he sometimes shows individualistic feelings and drives and acts in an unexpected and uncommon way. This is evident, for example, in the account of Moses's doubts during his

18 See Naphtali Herz Wessely, *Shirei tif'eret* (Berlin: Chevrat chinukh li-ne'arim, 1789), book 1, fols. 1a–5b. The citations below are taken from this edition. See also Noach Chaim Rosenbloom, *Ha-Epos ha-mikrai me-'idan ha-Haskalah ve-ha-parshanut* (Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, 1983), 3–52.

19 See Rosenbloom, *Ha-Epos*, 6–7. See also V. B. Shklovsky, *Khudozhestvennaia proza: Razmyshleniia i razbory* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1959), 271.

flight after killing the Egyptian soldier whom he saw beating the Hebrew slave.²⁰ Here it should be pointed out that the author's fidelity to the Bible is sometimes deleterious. Wessely wishes to remain faithful to the story as told in the Bible, and at the same time he wished to create an epic in the spirit of the German epics. However, Bible stories and the principles of the epic were never intended to be consistent with one another.

The epic form relates to external themes with little reference to esoteric matters, which ordinarily do not have a place here. An epic is supposed to concentrate on descriptions of the lofty, eminent, and brave deeds of the protagonist, in this case, Moses.²¹ These deeds should be described prominently, with emphasis, color, and concentration on the external details—the circumstances of his field of action, the details of his appearance—while little should be said of his inner psychic processes.²² In contrast, significant space in *Songs of Glory* is devoted to depicting Moses's inner world, his doubts, his torments, and his human weaknesses. Because of this emphasis, the work departs from the rules of the epic and assumes a dramatic form (see below).

6.5. The Figure of the Author and the Presentation of Chronological Order in Epic and in *Songs of Glory*

In the epic genre, there is an accepted rule that obligates the reduction of the importance and limitation of the function of the author, who is also the narrator. The epic concentrates on describing events that took place in an ancient time, and it emphasizes the chronological distance between that time and the present, which is to say, the time of the narrator. The period when the events of the epic occurred is meant to be presented in the work in a heroic, glorified, and idealistic tone, in contrast to the present, which is only alluded to in the work, and presented in a realistic, gray, and anti-heroic light.²³ The epic entails a considerable disparity between the glorious past, which is the patrimony of the entire nation and the present, of which the author is part. The author is not supposed to be close to the events described in the epic either temporally or

20 Wessely, *Shirei tif'eret*, book 1, fols. 27a–bff.

21 M. G. Bowra, "Some Characteristics of Literary Epic," in *The Epic, Developments in Criticism*, ed. R. P. Draper (London: Macmillan, 1990), 126–127.

22 G. V. Anikin, "Cherty epicheskogo povestvovaniia," in *Problemy metoda i zhanra v zarubezhnoi literature*, ed. N. A. Mikhail'skii, B. I. Purishev et al. (Moscow: Nauka, 1981), 3–20, esp. 11–14; see also J. B. Hainsworth, "What is an Epic?," in his *The Idea of Epic* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 5ff.

23 Bakhtin, *Epos i roman*, 204–208.

physically and spiritually: the heroes of the epic are similar to demigods, while the author is perceived as a regular person.²⁴

In contrast to the foregoing, the author of *Songs of Glory* occupies an important, even primary, position in his work. The authorial position is prominent with regard to the extent of the text that he devotes to himself and to his prayers to God. Thus, for example, the author addresses his Creator in a prolonged and emotional monologue, in which he justifies taking upon himself the task of paraphrasing the words of the Torah:

צורי! ספר זאת אל אחי חפצתי / נא השלם חפצי מאל מה יעצתי / האצל עלי
רוח ממעון קדשך / אם קטנתי ומחור קרצתי / לדרוש מעמך את זאת התאמצתי /
כי מעולם לא עזבת דורשך / רוח חן תצוק על שפתי שוחרך / טוב לכל משכני
ארוץ אחרך (מחברת ראשונה, עמ' ג' ב')

My Rock! To tell this to my brethren did I wish. / Please fulfill my
desire, God, what I counseled, / Instill within me a spirit from Thy
holy dwelling. / If I am too slight and was hewn from matter, / To
ask this of Thee I have endeavored, / For Thou hast never abandoned
those who seek Thee. / Pour a spirit of grace upon my lips that seek
Thee. / Thou, who art good to all, draw me after Thee.²⁵

The author also directs prayers to Heaven in matters of poetry:

היה נא עם פי למדני טוב טעם / אז שיר חדש אשירה לך הפעם / ופנינים אדלה!
מים חכמתך / כי זה הים גדול ורחב ידים / לא אוכל לעבור בו גאו המים / אל!
תעבירני בו צדקתך (שם, עמ' ד' א')

Abide, please, with my mouth, and teach me good taste, / Then I shall
sing a new song to Thee this time. / I shall draw pearls from the sea of
Thy wisdom, / For it is the great and expansive sea. / I cannot cross it,
the waters have risen. / God! May Thy righteousness bring me across it.²⁶

24 Olivia Rosenthal, "Épopée et roman dans les discours théoriques en France (XVIème-XVIIème siècles)," in *Plaisir de l'épopée*, ed. Gisele Mathieu-Castellani (Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2000), 179–182.

25 Wessely, *Shirei tif'eret*, book 1, fol. 4a.

26 Ibid.

The author directs lengthy and copious prayers to Heaven concerning many subjects, including his relations with his Maker, poetic inspiration sought from God, the greatness and power of the Creator of nature, general reflections on the mutual relations between God and the nations of the world, and a series of addresses to the author's brethren, wherever they may be, in foreign lands:

עתה הנפוצים מקדם עד ימה / אחי כלם! בארצות באתם שמה / שמעו מה פעל
אל! עמים הודהו! / אי אחי ספר דברי אלהינו / הקורות אשר קרו לאבותינו
(שם, עמ' ה' א')

Now scattered from East to West / All my brothers! In the lands where
you have come / Hear what God has done! Nations, praise Him! /
Where, my brethren, is the book of the deeds of our God, / The history
of what happened to our ancestors?²⁷

Although the invocations of the Almighty, per se, do not seem too different from the rules of the epic genre, the figure of the author in this epos is centrally present in the text, and actually occupies a focal place in the work, whereas the figure of Moses is largely relegated to the sidelines. The intensified presence of the author, who speaks in the first person and the present tense, shows the author's time as lively, and not darker than, or more inferior to, the epoch of Moses. This departure from the glorification of the heroic figure is contrary to the basic premises of the epic.

Sometimes, the words of the author appear to be sentimental effusions, which are boring and superfluous, and there is a feeling that the author wants to attract the reader's attention to himself as well. Such a digression from the principles of the epic, which is supposed to be exalted, and a focus on the personal and realistic figure of the author, retrospectively strengthen the grotesque impression of this work, depriving it of its character as an epic.

6.6. Epic and Dramatization

The protagonist of the epic should be depicted as heroic, in a highly idealized fashion. However, the character of Moses, who is already depicted in Aggadic Midrash, and in later traditional literature, with idealization that verges upon the mythological, and it is not possible to idealize him further. In contrast, depicting him as a versatile man tortured by human dilemmas would actually cause a diminution of his figure compared to traditional sources. Wessely deepens

27 Ibid., fol. 5a.

this departure from the rules of the epic by adding details and expanding upon the description of Moses's personal doubts and sufferings. For example, in the presence of the burning bush, Wessely provides a lengthy description of the whole range of the man's feelings and hesitations tearing him apart:

"אך מדוע לא יבער?" בינתו שואלת / פה אש פה להבה על מה תבערה אין?
/ המראה הזה גדול! נפלא הוא ממנו / "לולי עיני רואות לשמועה לא האמנתי /
אסורה מזה אקרב למקום הלהבת / שרש דבר אחקור מה חזיתי אבינה!" / רבו
מחשבותיו אך מגדולות לא הלכו / חכם לב כמוהו ההוא לא יבין דעת / כי אש
זאת אש אלהים היא אש מתלקחת? / [. . .] כראות חוקר לב כי מחשבותיו גם
יחד / גם אחת לא אמרה אש זאת הפלא פלא / [. . .] איש האלהים לא ידע את קול
מי שומע / כי עליון דובר עמו נפשו לא האמינה (מחברת שניה, ה' א-ו א')

"But why does it not burn?" his reason asks, "Here is fire and here is flame, so why is there no combustion? / This sight is great!" It is too marvelous for him. / "Were it not for my eyes that see, I would not believe this rumor. / I shall turn away and approach the place of the flame. / I will get to the root of the thing, so that I understand what I have seen!" / Many were his thoughts, but they did not stray from great things. / Could a man of wise heart like him not understand / That this fire was the fire of God, the fire that is not consumed? / [. . .] As when God examines his heart sees that of all his thoughts together / Not even a single thought told him this fire is a miracle / [. . .] The man of God did not know whose voice he heard / For his soul did not believe that the Supreme Being would speak to him.²⁸

Wessely devotes attention to a description of Moses's inner world, and he makes certain to develop the realistic aspects of the character. For example, by describing his astonishment and bewilderment before the burning bush, he conveys his failure to comprehend its meaning and his inability to resolve the difficulties that appear in his path on his own. This portrayal ultimately leads to humanization, as against glorification and mythologization, of the figure of Moses. That, in turn, channels to dramatization and secularization, as against sacredization, of the entire work. Thus, we have another departure from the epic.²⁹

The tendency toward dramatization, which is not typical of the epic, is also notable in the portrayal of other characters and in this work. Here, for example,

28 Ibid., book 2, fols. 5a–6a.

29 Hainsworth, "What is an Epic?," 3ff.

is a rather dramatic conversation between the Pharaoh and the midwives who violated his orders to kill the boys born to Hebrew mothers. The scene, in which the midwives realize that Pharaoh knows what they have been doing and reprimands them, is full of dramatic tension more appropriate to other genres such as the novel. The Pharaoh begins with a long speech of admonition, including a veiled threat to the midwives:

זעף וישלח למילדות מלאכי זעם/ לבוא לפני המרצח הזה נקראו / דבר אליהן
ושפתיו כאש צרבת / [. .] "מדוע עשיתן זאת? למה רמיתוני? / לעשות מצותי
הבטחתן ואותי על שקר / וגמול טוב הבטחתי אתכן הפלתן ארצה / הוי בוגדות!
לא חמלתן עליכן אתנה/ ומה תוחלנה כי אחמול עליכן אני". (מחברת ראשונה,
ח' ב' ואילך).

He was angry and sent angels of fury against the midwives. / To come before that murderer they were summoned. / He spoke to them, and his lips burned like fire / [. .] "Why did you do this? Why did you deceive me? / To do my bidding you promised, and you must not lie to me. / And the good reward I have promised you, you have thrown to the earth. / Oh traitors! Their mercy on you I will not give, / And how did you hope that I would have mercy on you?"³⁰

For their part, the midwives respond with a speech no less lengthy, in which they justify themselves and present themselves as weak and helpless, as they also try to persuade the Pharaoh to rescind the decree. Such a scene, permeated with tension, is superfluous in an epic, with its heroic spirit, full of pathos, and it retrospectively diminishes the Pharaoh's stature. The Pharaoh, who ultimately is convinced by the midwives' vain words, emerges as a gullible fool, a figure without authority, unstable, and even frivolous. In other words, his character is not regal, which makes him appear in a grotesque light and shows his character in parodic fashion.

6.7. The Representation of Time in Epic

In the epic, as in many other genres, the dimension of time is represented in a particular manner. In ancient epics, there was no distinction of the vicissitudes of time: it was depicted as static or as developing circularly, returning to its point of origin. This is understandable and appropriate, for recognition of the vicissitudes of time in the epic would have led to additional dramatization of

30 Wessely, *Shirei tif'eret*, book 1, 8bff.

the plot (see above).³¹ Although historical perspective does appear in the later epic, generally emerging from the narrator's opening statements or concluding remarks, within the epic itself time remains linear, moving from the past, through the present, to the future, without retrospection and without judgment from a later historical perspective.³²

In contrast to this depiction of time, which is the accepted yardstick of the epic, the depiction of time in *Songs of Glory* is different. Thus, in *Songs of Glory* there is a combination of emotionally charged descriptions of the protagonist, as in the epic, with lengthy, rationalistic, diachronic explanations in the spirit of the Haskalah (the Jewish Enlightenment movement), which the author provides for the protagonist's behavior.³³ Moreover, the author's tendency to explain the wonders and miracles that attended the Israelites' exodus from Egypt in rationalistic, realistic fashion, creates a strange mixture of the ancient conception of time, that of the period of Moses, and the conception current in the author's lifetime.³⁴ This irregular combination of temporal planes detracts from the emotional and heroic atmosphere ordinarily characteristic of the genre.

6.8. Epic and *Songs of Glory*: Between Pathos and Parody

As one reads *Songs of Glory*, one increasingly gains the impression that the work lies on the border between the pathos of the epic and a parody of it. The parody produced in *Songs of Glory* is unintended by the author and unbeknownst to him. Such parody might have been theoretically created retroactively in the course of producing a tragedy, or a work of pathos, or a sentimental work, written in the spirit of idealization. The author's original intention is indeed to strengthen those aspects of his work, but the parodic and satiric aspects might have been therefore produced antithetically, in particular because of his excessive emphasizing. European literature offers many examples of this phenomenon—it is sufficient, for example, to mention *Madame Bovary* by Gustave Flaubert. Flaubert identifies personally and sincerely with his main character and her fate.³⁵

The same also holds true for *Songs of Glory*. The extreme pathos in this work, which was proper and accepted in Klopstock's *Messiade* in 1748,

31 Anikin, "Cherty epicheskogo povestvovaniia," 10ff.

32 A. Ia. Gurevich, "Vremia kak vopros v istorii kul'tury," *Voprosy filosofii* 3 (1963): 108, 116.

33 Wessely, *Shirei tif'eret*, book 2, fols. 37b–38b.

34 Ibid., fols. 41a–43b.

35 See Michele Breut, *Le haut et le bas: essai sur le grotesque dans Madame Bovary de Gustave Flaubert* (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994).

unintentionally appears as parodic, sarcastic, and satiric in 1785, almost forty years later, when *Songs of Glory* was published. At that time, when the genre of epos was in decline, naïve epic works such as *Songs of Glory* inevitably would appear as parodic, sarcastic, and satiric, whether written so intentionally by the author, or unintentionally.³⁶

Furthermore, the parodic impression also emerges in the light of the mixtures of various belletristic components belonging to different and even contrasting genres that accrue in this work. The elements of a genre full of pathos like the epic are placed in a forced manner together with realistic and dramatic elements. The mixture of exalted heroism with ordinary human life, with all its weaknesses, creates a ridiculous effect that eventually leads to strengthening the parodic aspect. The tiresome intervention of the author in the flow of the narrative violates the principle of the epic so that, in the end, if only inadvertently, an absurd and parodic atmosphere is created. Wessely clearly did not intend to create an impression bordering upon parody.³⁷

This mixture of elements from various and even contradictory genres or of belletristic components taken from various contexts, which are not meant to be placed together, is the tried and true recipe for parody, whether or not the author intends it. It is sufficient to recall two internationally famous parodies that were also penned near the time of *Songs of Glory*. The first, written several decades before the publication of the Hebrew epic, is *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman* (1759–1767) by the English author Lawrence Sterne (1713–1768). The parody aspect of that work derives, among other things, from the combination of components belonging to various generic and even opposing sources. This unbridled mixture sets up various points of view, beyond the ponderous, customary position of the protagonist, regarding matters ordinarily regarded as exalted and full of pathos. Similarly, with the intention of crafting a grotesque parody, Lawrence Sterne frequently deviates from the conventions for the creation of a novel. Among other things there are unexplained digressions from the course of the plot, the presentation of the honorable main protagonist as a kind of antihero, and the constant intervention of the author in the flow of the narrative. The parody side of *Tristram Shandy* is not immediately evident, and at first glance the novel can be read as decidedly sentimental. However, the combination of components characteristic of sentimentalism with elements that

36 Ibid.

37 "Parody," in *Dictionary of World Literature*, ed. Joseph T. Shipley (Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams, 1972), 298–299.

belong to other genres does produce the parody stratum.³⁸ This parody, which, as noted, was published more than twenty years before *Songs of Glory*, was translated into most European languages, and was influential on the formation of parodies in those literatures. Wessely might have been familiar with this work and should have known that his way of depicting the epic would create an effect opposite to the desired.

The other parody of the epic is Eugene Onegin, a novel in rhyme by the Russian author Alexander Pushkin (1799–1837), first published in serial form in 1825–1832. This work was also known throughout the Western world at that time, and the parody stratum in it was built by the combination of contrasting styles and tendencies, such as pathos and realism, sentimentalism presented as playful, and a tragicomic tone combined with irony. Unexplained deviations from the plot line and the teasing interventions of the author in the flow of the narrative (during which he also frequently pours out his heart before the reader), are both amusing and repugnant. These traits give the work comic, grotesque parody, and satiric elements, alongside the tragic and sentimental dimension.³⁹

One can add other examples from European literature of the period of *Songs of Glory* in order to demonstrate how the grotesque and parody aspect of works is created by merging elements of opposing genres. However, it should be noted that, in most such works, that aspect is not the primary and decisive one. Rather, it is secondary and emerges retrospectively in works that are primarily texts of pathos, positivism, and sentimentalism.

Wessely also created such a fabric of genres and styles, largely out of his affinity with Klopstock's epic, the *Messiad* (as noted above). However, at the same time, he did not give attention to the existence of other works in which a similar mosaic of elements is present, though in them it serves precisely the opposite purpose. The combination of such elements was already known at his time as a stratagem intended to create humor, and Wessely's readership was also aware of its existence. It is not possible to state with certainty that Wessely arrived too late to write an epic full of pathos such as those that had developed in the history of European literature. Nevertheless, it is clear that his work, which was intended to produce a revolution in Hebrew literature, appeared in

38 See V. B. Shklovsky, "The Novel as Parody: Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*," in his *Theory of Prose*, trans. Benjamin Sher (Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990), 147–170; Shklovsky, *Khudozhestvennaia proza*, 271.

39 Dean A. Miller, *The Epic Hero* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2000), 255–258; see also my article: "Roman be-charuzim 'Yevgeni Onegin' shel Alexander Pushkin be-targumo ha-yivri shel Avraham Shlonsky," *Mechkarei Yerushalaim be-sifrut yivrit* 20 (2006): 353–370.

a borderline period when epic works, full of pathos and high sentiments, were descending from the literary stage and giving way to parodies and satires.⁴⁰

6.9. Summary

Indeed, it is impossible to imagine that Wessely intended to produce a work with a secondary parody character, in addition to the primary character of his epic, which is positivistic in character. Nevertheless, one should relate to this epic in its broad context. It must be seen, interpreted, and evaluated against the background of parallel developments in European literature, especially because of its close connection with them, and mainly with the genre of the German epic of his period (see above).

In European literature of that time, the stratagem of producing a parodic tone by means of the unexplained accretion of components from various genres was already familiar, especially the use of elements taken from genres which are not supposed to be placed together. The British author Lawrence Sterne, and the Russian poet Alexander Pushkin, had already produced a mosaic of many and various styles, including imitation, the maintaining of a dialogue between the author and the reader and between the author and God, as well as the revelation of the narrator in the course of the narrative. These devices produced a grotesque, dramatic, parodic, and satiric tone, and they do not appear in the epic, which has a unified style, elevated and full of pathos.⁴¹

Such a mixture also appears in Wessely's work. The author constantly looks beyond the enchanted world of the imagination that the epic is supposed to offer the reader, exposes his own feelings against the background of descriptions of the exalted deeds of the patriarchs, incongruously combines the ancient period of Moses with that of his own time, imitates prayers, and makes numerous other digressions.⁴² However, Wessely was apparently not experienced enough in belletristic composition, especially of epic works, and he was probably unfamiliar with the stratagems that were used in European literature of his day.

40 About the somewhat late development of the genre of Hebrew and Yiddish novel see Dan Miron, *Bein chazon le-emet: Nitzavei ha-roman ha-yivri ve-ha-yidi be-mea ha-tsha-esre* (Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1979); and the expanded English edition: Dan Miron, *A Traveler Disguised: A Study in the Rise of Modern Yiddish Fiction in the Nineteenth Century* (Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1968).

41 Bakhtin, *Voprosy*, 76–92; Mikhail Bakhtin, *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaia kul'tura Srednevekov'ia i Renessansa* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965); also Hainsworth, "What is an Epic?," 7.

42 Shklovsky, "The Novel as Parody: Sterne's *Tristram Shandy*," 147–170.

Indeed, one may claim that this epic belongs to the literature of the Hebrew revival, but, from the literary view, this form of expressing the feeling of revival was outmoded by the time this work was created. The creation of this epic was an important innovation with important significance for Hebrew literature, but it appeared in a period when signs of the decline of the epic and other genres full of pathos were evident in European literature. It testifies in fact to the delay in the development of Hebrew literature in comparison to its European siblings.

Bibliography

- Alter, Robert. *The Invention of Hebrew Prose: Modern Fiction and the Language of Realism*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988.
- . “Magic Realism in the Israeli Novel.” In *The Bloom in Contemporary Israeli Fiction*, edited by Alan Mintz, 17–34. Hanover: Brandeis University Press, 1997.
- Anikin, G. V. “Cherty epicheskogo povestvovaniia” [Characteristics of epic narrative]. In *Problemy metoda i zhanra v zarubezhnoi literature* [Problems of method and genre in foreign literatures], edited by N. A. Mikhalskii, B. I. Purishev et al., 3–20. Moscow: Nauka, 1981.
- Annenkov, P. V. *Literaturnye vospominaniia* [Literary memoirs]. Introduction by V. I. Kuleshov, notes by A. M. Dolotova, G. G. Elizavetina, I. V. Mann, and I. B. Pavlova. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1983.
- Bakhtin, M. M. *Tvorchestvo Fransua Rable i narodnaia kul'tura Srednevekov'ia i Renessansa* [Rabelais and the folk culture of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965.
- . *Voprosy literatury i estetiki* [Issues in literature and aesthetics]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1975.
- . *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* [Aesthetics of verbal creativity]. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979.
- . *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo* [Problems in the poetics of Dostoevsky]. Moscow: Sovetskaia Rossiia, 1979.
- . *Epos i roman* [Epic and novel]. St. Petersburg: Azbuka, 2000.
- Barel, Yehudit. *Ha-Poema ha-ivrit me-hithavuta ve-ad re'shit ha-me'a ha-esrim: Michkar be-toldot ha-zhanr* [The Hebrew long poem from its emergence to the beginning of the twentieth century: A study in the history of a genre]. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1995.
- Barzel, Hillel. “Yehuda Leib Gordon: Yahadut ve-hitbolelut” [Yehuda Leib Gordon: Jewry and assimilation]. In *Maskil ba-et ha-zot—Sefer yovel le-Moshe Pelli, ma'amarim be-Haskalah, sifrut yivrit ve-limmudei yahadut* [Maskil in our time: Studies in honor of Moshe Pelli, articles in Haskalah, Hebrew literature, and Jewish studies], edited by Zeev Gerber, Lev Khakak, and Shemuel Katz, 40–65. Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad, 2017.

- Ben-Yeshurun (Kitaikeshet), Yaakov. *Ha-Shira ha-rusit ve-hashpa'ata al ha-shira ha-yivrit ha-chadasha* [Russian poetry and its influence on new Hebrew poetry]. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1955.
- Berdiaev, N. A. *Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov: Ocherk* [Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov: An essay]. Moscow: Tipografiia A. I. Mamontova, 1912. Reprinted: Farnborough: Gregg Publishing House, 1971.
- . *Filosofia neravenstva. Pis'ma k nedrugam po sotsial'noi filosofii* [The philosophy of inequality. A letter to my foes concerning social philosophy]. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1970.
- . "O 'vechno bab'em' v russkoi dushe" [On the "eternal womanly" in the Russian soul]. In his *Sobranie sochinenii* [Collected works], vol. 3, 361–362. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1989–1990.
- . *Sud'ba Rossii* [The fate of Russia]. Moscow: AST, 2004.
- Bernstein, J. M. *The Philosophy of the Novel: Lukacs, Marxism and the Dialectics of Form*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- Bezlepkin, N. I., "Nemetskii idealizm i russkaia filosofia iazyka" [German idealism and Russian philosophy of language]. In *Russkaia i evropeiskaia filosofia: Puti skhozhdeniia* [Russian and European philosophy: Paths of concurrence], ed. E. M. Ananieva, A. M. Bol'shakov, and E. G. Sokolov, 165–171. St. Petersburg: Kafedra, 1997.
- Bialik, Chayyim Nachman. "Levad—Kullam nasa ha-ruach, kullam sachaf ha-or" [Alone—wind blew, light drew them all]. In his *Shirim* [Poems], edited by Rut Nevo, 109. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1981. For English translation, see Chaim Nachman Bialik, "Alone," <http://www.poetryinternationalweb.net/pi/site/poem/item/3345/auto/0/0/Chaim-Nachman-Bialik/ALONE>.
- . "Levad—Kullam nasa ha-ruach, kullam sachaf ha-or" [Alone—wind blew, light drew them all]. In his *Ktavav* [Collected writings], vol. 1, 141–142. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1965.
- . "Ba-yir ha-harega" [In the city of slaughter]. In his *Ktavav* [Collected writings], vol. 1, 350–360. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1965.
- . "Meuvat lo yukhal litkon" [That which is distorted cannot be corrected]. In his *Ktavav* [Collected writings], vol. 2, 175–179. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1965.
- Biro, Sandor. *The Nationalities Problem in Transylvania, 1867–1940: A Social History of the Romanian Minority under Hungarian Rule, 1867–1918, and of the Hungarian Minority under Romanian Rule, 1918–1940*. Translated by M. D. Fenyo, Highland Lakes, NJ: East European Monographs, 1992.
- Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975.

- Bowra, M. G. "Some Characteristics of Literary Epic." In *The Epic, Developments in Criticism*, edited by R. P. Draper, 121–130. London: Macmillan, 1990.
- Brennan, Joseph Gerald. *Three Philosophical Novelists: James Joyce, Andre Gide, Thomas Mann*. New York: The Macmillan Company, London: Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1964.
- Brenner, Yossef Chayyim. *Misaviv la-nekuda* [Around the dot]. In his *Kol ktavav* [Collected writings], vol. 1. Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad, 1960–1978.
- . *Mi-kan umi-kan. Shesh machberot u-miluim* [From here and there: Six notebooks and additions]. Warsaw: Sifrut, 1911.
- Breut, Michele. *Le haut et le bas: essai sur le grotesque dans Madame Bovary de Gustave Flaubert*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994.
- Budnitskii, Oleg. *Rossiiskie evrei mezhdu krasnymi i belymi* [Russian Jews between Reds and Whites, 1917–1920]. Moscow: Rossiiskaia politicheskaiia entsiklopedia, 2005.
- Casaliggi, Carmen. *Romanticism: A Literary and Cultural History*. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- Cebrian, Reyes Bertolin. *Comic Epic and Parodies of Epic: Literature for Youth and Children in Ancient Greece*. Zurich: George Olms Verlag Hildesheim, 2008.
- Chaadayev, Peter Yakovlevich [Peter J. Tschaadajew]. "Philosophischen Briefe" [Philosophical letters]. Translated by Heinrich Falk. In Heinrich Falk, *Das Weltbild Peter J. Tschaadajews nach seinen acht "Philosophischen Briefen"* [Peter Chaadayev's worldview according to his eight "Philosophical letters"], 85–128. Munich: Isar Verlag, 1954.
- . "Apology of a Madman." In his *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, translated with an introduction by Mary-Barbara Zeldin, 161–178. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1969.
- . "The Apologia of a Madman." In his *The Major Works*, translated and commentary by Raymond McNally, introduction by Richard Pipes, 199–220. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- . "Philosophical Letters." In his *Philosophical Letters and Apology of a Madman*, translated with an introduction by Mary-Barbara Zeldin, 29–160. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1969.
- . "The Philosophical Letters." In his *The Major Works*, translated and commentary by Raymond McNally, introduction by Richard Pipes, 21–198. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- . [Petr Iakovlevich Chaadaev]. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis'ma* [Collection of all works and selected letters]. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1991.

- [Petr Iakovlevich Chaadaev]. *Filosoficheskie pis'ma. Sbornik* [The Philosophical letters. Collection]. Moscow: Direkt-Media, 2016.
- Cherkasova, Evgenia. *Dostoevsky and Kant: Dialogues on Ethics*. Foreword by George L. Kline. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2009.
- Compagnon, Antoine. *Literature, Theory, and Common Sense*. Translated by Carol Cosman. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998.
- Dostoevskii, F. M. *Dnevnik pisatel'ia, 1873* [The author's diary, 1873]. In his *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridsati tomakh* [Collected works in thirty volumes], vol. 21. Leningrad: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1980.
- Dralle, Lothar. *Die Deutschen in Ostmittel- und Osteuropa: Ein Jahrtausend europäischer Geschichte* [The Germans in Central Western and Western Europe: A thousand years of European history]. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1991.
- Dumoulié, Camille. *Literature et philosophie. Le gai de la littérature*. Paris: Armand Colin, 2002.
- Egorov, B. F. *Bor'ba estetikeskikh idei v Rossii serediny 1860-kh godov* [The struggle of aesthetic ideas in Russia in mid-1860s]. Leningrad: Iskusstvo, 1991.
- Eremeev, A. A. "O kontseptsii 'filosofskaia proza'" [On the concept of philosophic prose]. *Voprosy literatury* 55, no. 1 (1990): 84–91.
- Ermichov, A. A., and A. A. Zlatopol'skaia. "P. Ia. Chaadaev v russkoi mysli. Opyt istoriografii" [Petr Chaadaev in Russian thought. Attempt of historiography]. Introduction to *P. Ia. Chaadaev: PRO ET CONTRA. Lichnost' i tvorchestvo Petra Chaadaeva v otsenke russkikh myslitelei i issledovatelei* [Petr Chaadaev: PRO ET CONTRA. The personality and work of Petr Chaadaev in the assessment of Russian thinkers and researchers], edited by D. K. Burlak, 7–40. St. Petersburg: Russkii khristianskii gumanitarnyi institut, 1998.
- Ettinger, Shemuel. *Toldot am Yisrael mi-mahapekhot 1848 ad le-hakamat medinat Yisrael* [History of the Jewish people from the revolutions of 1848 until the establishment of the state of Israel]. Jerusalem: Akademon, 1966.
- . *Toldot am Yisrael* [History of the Jewish people], vol. 3: *Toldot Yisrael be-et he-chadasha* [History of the Jewish people in the modern age]. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1969.
- . "Ha-reka' ha-ideologi le-hofa'ata shel ha-sifrut ha-antishemit ha-chadasha be-Rusia" [The ideological background for the emergence of the new antisemitic literature in Russia]. *Tzion* 35 (1970): 193–225.
- . *Bein Polin le-Rusia* [Between Poland and Russia]. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1994.

- Fedotov, G. P. *Sud'ba i grekhi Rossii* [Fate and sins of Russia]. St. Petersburg: Sofia, 1991.
- Ferber, Michael. *Romanticism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Foley, John Miles. *Traditional Epic. The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.
- Gertsen, A. I. *Byloe i dumy* [The past and reflections about it]. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1947.
- . *Russkie nemtsy i nemetskie russkie* [Russian Germans and German Russians]. Moscow: Direkt-Media, 2012.
- Gordon, Yehudah Leib. *Lilmod et sfat ha-moledet. Ma'amarav shel Y. L. Gordon be-Voschod ba-shanim 1881–1882* [To learn one's mother tongue. Collected translations of Y. L. Gordon's Essays in "Voskhod," 1881–1882]. Translated, edited, and introduction by Rina Lapidus. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 2012.
- . *Ktavav* [Writings]. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1959–1960.
- Grigor'ev, A. A. *Iskusstvo i nravstvennost'* [Art and ethics]. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1986.
- Gudzii, N. K. *Lev Tolstoi. Kritiko-biograficheskii ocherk* [Leo Tolstoy. A critical and biographical essay]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1960.
- Gulyga, A. V. *Shelling*. Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1982.
- Gurevich, A. Ia. "Vremia kak vopros v istorii kul'tury" [Time as a question in the history of culture]. *Voprosy filosofii* 3 (1963): 105–116.
- Gurevich-Lishchiner, S. D. P. Ia. *Chaadaev v kul'ture dvukh vekov* [Petr Chaadayev in the culture of the two centuries]. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istoriia, 2006.
- Halkin, Shimon. *Zeramim ve-tzurot ba-sifrut ha-yivrit ha-chadasha* [Currents and forms in modern Hebrew literature], vol. 1: *Perakim be-sifrut ha-Haskalah ve-Chibbat Tzion* [Chapters in literature of Haskalah and Chibbat Zion]. Edited by Tzipora Kagan. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1984.
- Hainsworth, J. B. "What is an Epic?" In his *The Idea of Epic*, 3–10. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Hardie, Philip. *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Hazaz, Chayyim. "Nakhar shotef" [A rushing river]. In his *Chagurat mazalot: Sippurim* [Belt of zodiac signs: stories], 164–263. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1970. Reprinted in his *Asara sippurim* [Ten stories], 11–111. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1988.
- . "Mi-zeh umi-zeh" [From this and that]. *Ha-Tekufa* 21 (1924): 7–32.
- . *Shemuel Frankfurter. Ha-Tekufa* 23 (1925): 81–134. Reprinted in his *Pirkei*

- mahapekha* [Chapters of revolution], 237–284. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1980.
- Herder, Johann Gottfried von. *Vom Geist der ebraeischen Poesie: eine Anleitung fuer die Liebhaber derselben, und der aeltesten Geschichte des menschlichen Geistes* [On the spirit of Hebrew poetry: A guide for those who love it, and the oldest story of the human spirit]. Dessau: Buchhandlung der Gelehrten, 1782.
- Himka, John-Paul. *Galician Villagers and the Ukrainian National Movement in the Nineteenth Century*. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1988.
- Hitchins, Keith. *The Idea of Nation: The Romanians of Transylvania, 1692–1849*. Bucharest: Encyclopaedic Publishing House, 1985.
- Hogan, Patrick Colm. *Philosophical Approaches to the Study of Literature*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2000.
- Horowitz, Brian. *Jewish Nationalism and Acculturation in 19th- and Early 20th-Century Russia*. New Orleans: Tulane University Press, 2009.
- . *Russian Idea—Jewish Presence: Essays on Russian-Jewish Intellectual Life*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2013.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav. “O russkoi idee” [On the Russian idea]. In his *Rodnoe i vselenskoe* [National and universal], 360–372. Moscow: Respublika, 1994.
- Isupov, K.G. and V. F. Boikov. “Lichnost’ P. Ia. Chaadaeva i ego filosofii istorii” [The personality of Petr Chaadayev and his philosophy of history]. In *Rossiia glazami russkogo. Chaadaev, Leont’ev, Solov’ev* [Russia through the Eyes of a Russian. Chaadayev, Leontyev, Solovyev], edited and introduced by A. F. Zamaleev, 155–168. St. Petersburg: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1991. Reprinted in *P. Ia. Chaadaev: PRO ET CONTRA. Lichnost’ i tvorchestvo Petra Chaadaeva v otsenke russkikh myslitelei i issledovatelei* [Petr Chaadayev: PRO ET CONTRA. The personality and work of Petr Chaadayev in the assessment of Russian thinkers and researchers], edited by D. K. Burlak, 159–168. St. Petersburg: Russkii khristianskii gumanitarnyi institut, 1998.
- Jones, Peter. *Philosophy and the Novel: Philosophical Aspects of “Middlemarch”, “Anna Karenina”, “The Brothers Karamazov”, “A la recherche du temps perdu” and of the Methods of Criticism*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Kamenskii, Z. A. “Paradoksy Chaadaeva” [Chaadayev’s paradoxes]. In *P. Ia. Chaadaev, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pis’ma* [Complete works and selected letters], edited by Z. A. Kamenskii, vol. 1, 9–85. Moscow: Akademiia nauk SSSR, 1991.
- Kann, Robert A., and V. David Zdenek. *The Peoples of the Eastern Habsburg Lands, 1526–1918*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1984.
- Khomiakov, Aleksei. “Neskol’ko slov o ‘Filosoficheskom pis’me’” [Some words

- about "A philosophical letter"]. *Simvol* 16 (1986): 121–134.
- . *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii Alekseia Stepanovicha Khomiakova* [Complete collection of the works of Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov]. 3rd ed. Moscow: Universitetskaia tipografiia na Strastnom bul'vare, 1900–1906.
- . *Izbrannye sochineniia* [Selected works], edited and introduced by N. S. Arsen'ev. New York: Chekhov Publishers, 1955.
- Kirievskii, I. V. *Kritika i estetika* [Criticism and aesthetics]. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1979.
- Klausner, Yosef. *Ha-historia shel ha-sifrut ha-yivrit ha-chadasha* [History of modern Hebrew literature]. Jerusalem: Achiasaf, 1936–1950. Reprinted 1960.
- Kopelman, Zoya. *Nokhechuto shel Mikael Lermontov ba-shira ha-yivrit, mi-emtza' ha-me'a ha-19 ve-ad yameinu* [Presence of Michael Lermontov in Hebrew poetry, from the middle of the nineteenth century and till our days]. PhD dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 2003.
- Kozik, Jan, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia: 1815–1849*. Edited and introduced by Lawrence D. Orton, Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, University of Alberta, 1986.
- Kozlowski, Eligiusz. "The Polish Nation and the Hungarian Revolution of 1848–1849." In *East Central European Society and War in the Era of Revolutions, 1775–1856*, edited by Bela K. Kiraly, 578–590. New York: Brooklyn College Press, 1984.
- Kravchenko, P. P. *Sviataia Rus'. Istoricheskaia missiia, natsional'naia ideia, forma pravleniia* [The holy Russia, its historical mission, national idea, form of government]. Moscow: Vozrozhdenie, 2014.
- Lachover, Fishel Yeruham. *Toldot ha-sifrut ha-yivrit ha-chadasha* [History of modern Hebrew literature]. Tel Aviv: Devir, 1936.
- Lapidus, Rina. "'Al liv'yatan ve-shor ha-bar—bein Brenner le-Dostoevski" [About the whale and the wild bull—between Brenner and Dostoyevsky]. *Moznayim* 59, nos. 1–2 (1985): 31–34.
- . *Between Snow and Desert Heat: Russian Influences on Hebrew Literature, 1870–1970*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 2003.
- . "Dostoyevsky be-levush yuhaduti—'Ha-chet ve-onsho' ba-targumo shel Y. Ch. Brenner" [Dostoyevsky in Jewish garb—*Crime and Punishment* translated by Y. Ch. Brenner]. *Jerusalem Studies in Hebrew Literature* 14 (1993): 275–291.
- . "Pirkei ha-mahapekha le-Hazaz ke-parodia la-sifrut ha-ide'ologit ha-sovvetit" [Hazaz's 'Chapters of the Revolution' as a parody of Soviet ideological literature]. *Bikoret u-Parshanut* 33 (1998): 49–59.

- . “‘Ba'al ha-bait ve-ha-poel' me-et L. N. Tolstoy be-targumo ha-yivri shel Y. Ch. Brenner” [L. N. Tolstoy's “The master and his worker” in Y. Ch. Brenner's Hebrew translation]. In *Misaviv la-nekuda: Mechkarim chadashim 'al M. Y. Berdichevsky, Y. Ch. Brenner, A. D. Gordon* [Around the dot: New studies on M. Y. Berdichevsky, Y. Ch. Brenner, and A. D. Gordon], edited by Avner Holtzman, Gideon Katz, and Shalom Ratzabi, 187–209. Beer Sheva: Ben Gurion University of the Negev, 2008.
- . “Mussagim ve-tavniot: Ha-lashon ha-rusit be-‘Misaviv la-nekuda’ le-Y. Ch. Brenner” [Pattern concepts: Russian language in Y. Ch. Brenner's “Around the dot”]. In *Nekudot mifne ba-sifrut ha-yivrit ve-zikatan la-maga'yim im sifruyot acherot* [Turning points in Hebrew literature in relation to its contact with other literatures], edited by Z. Shamir and A. Holzmann, 157–165. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Press, 1993.
- . “Roman be-charuzim ‘Yevgeni Onegin’ shel Aleksandr Pushkin be-targumo ha-yivri shel Avraham Shlonsky” [Novel in Verse: ‘Yevgeni Onegin’ by Alexander Pushkin in Hebrew translation by Avraham Shlonsky]. *Mechkarei Yerushalaim be-sifrut yivrit* 20 (2006): 353–370.
- Lermontov, Mikhail [Mikhail Lermontov]. “Kogda volnuetsia zhelteiushchaia niva . . .” [When the yellow field flutters . . .]. In his *Sobranie sochinenii v chetyrekh tomakh* [Collected writings in four volumes], vol. 1, 421. Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958.
- . “Vykhozhu odin ia na dorogu” [I come out to the path alone]. In his *Sobranie sochinenii v chetyrekh tomakh* [Collected writings in four volumes], vol. 1, 543–544. Moscow and Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR, 1958.
- . “When the Yellow Field Flutters. . .” Translated by Opal Moon. <http://lyricstranslate.com/en/kogda-volnuetsya-zhelteyushchaya-niva>.
- . “When, in the Cornfield, Yellow Waves are Rising. . .” Translated by Yevgeny Bonver, edited by Dmitry Karshtedt. https://www.poetryloverspage.com/poets/lermontov/when_in_corny_field.html.
- . “I Come out to the Path. . .” Translated by Yevgeny Bonver. https://www.poetryloverspage.com/poets/lermontov/i_come_out_to_path.html.
- . “I Go out on the Road Alone. . .” In *From the Ends to the Beginning: A Bilingual Anthology of Russian Poetry*. Translated by Tatiana Tulchinsky, Andrew Wachtel, and Gwenan Wilbur, edited by Ilya Kutik and Andrew Wachtel. http://max.mmlc.northwestern.edu/mdenner/Demo/texts/road_alone.html.
- Levandovskii, A. A. *Vremia Granovskogo. U istokov formirovaniia russkoi*

- intelligentsii* [The epoch of Granovskii. At the beginning of the shaping of the Russian intelligentsia]. Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1990.
- Litvak, Olga. *Haskalah. The Romantic Movement in Judaism*. New Brunswick, New Jersey, London: Rutgers University Press, 2012.
- Maksimov, D. E. *Poeziia Lermontova* [Poetry by Lermontov], edited by G. M. Friedlaender. Moscow: Nauka, 1964.
- . “O dvukh stikhotvorenniakh Lermontova” [About two poems by Lermontov.] In *Russkaia klassicheskaia literatura. Razbory i analizy* [Classical Russian literature: Studies and analyses], edited by D. Ustiuzhin, 127–147. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1969.
- Marković, Marko. *La Philosophie de l'inégalité et les idées politiques de Nicolas Berdiaev*. Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1978.
- Meiniger, Thomas Albert. *The Formation of a Nationalist Bulgarian Intelligentsia, 1835–1878*. PhD diss., University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1974.
- Miller, Dean A. *The Epic Hero*. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Milner-Gullard, R. R. “‘My Soul’s Anxiety is Stilled . . .’: An Analysis of Mikhail Lermontov’s ‘Kogda Volnuetsia Zhelteiushchaia Niva. . . .’” In *Mikhail Lermontov—Commemorative Essays*, edited by A. Briggs, 79–88. Birmingham: Birmingham University Press, 1991.
- Miron, Dan. *A Traveler Disguised: A Study in the Rise of Modern Yiddish Fiction in the Nineteenth Century*. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press, 1968.
- . *Bein chazon la-emet: Nitzavei ha-roman ha-yivri veva-yidi be-mea ha-tsha-esre* [Between dream and truth: The beginnings of Hebrew and Yiddish novel in the nineteenth century]. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1979.
- Miron, Dan, ed. *Ha-chayim be-appo shel ha-netzach: Yetzirato shel Uri Nisan Gnesin—chamisha machzorei yiyunim* [Living face to face with eternity: The works of Uri Nisan Gnessin: A study in five cycles]. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1997.
- Mondry, Henrietta. *Exemplary Bodies: Constructing the Jew in Russian Culture since the 1880s*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2009.
- Murav, Harriet, and Eugene Avrutin, eds. *Jews in the East European Borderlands: Essays in Honor of John Klier*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2011.
- Nathan, Esther. *Ha-poema “Metei midbar”—shorasheya ba-shira ha-rusit ve-ha-yivrit* [The poem “The dead of the desert”—its roots in Russian and Hebrew poetry]. PhD diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1986.
- . “Tchernichovski u-Vialik: Shirei ha-gevura ve-ha-khoach ve-zikatam la-simbolizm ha-rusi” [Tchernichowsky and Bialik: Songs of Might and heroism and their affinity to Russian symbolism]. In *Proceedings of the*

- Tenth World Congress of Judaic Studies*, 151–158. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University in Jerusalem, 1990. Reprinted as an expanded version in *Tchernichovski: Mechkarim ve-te'udot* [Tchernichovsky: Documents and studies], edited by Boaz Orfali, 199–216. Jerusalem: Mosad Bialik, 1994.
- . *Ha-derekh le-"Metei midbar"—'al poema shel Bialik ve-ha-shira ha-rusit* [The way to "The dead of the desert"—On Bialik's poem and Russian poetry]. Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad, 1993.
- Nosov, S. N. *Apollon Grigor'ev. Sud'ba i tvorchestvo* [Apollon Grigoryev: His life and work]. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.
- O'Neill, Michael, and Mark Sandy, eds. *Romanticism: Critical Concepts in Literary and Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Ostrowski, Donald. "Moscow the 'Third Rome' as Historical Ghost." In *Byzantium, Faith, and Power (1261–1557): Perspectives on Late Byzantine Art and Culture*, edited by Sara T. Brooks, 170–179. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.
- Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, D. N. *Sobranie sochinenii v devyati tomakh* [Collected works in nine volumes]. St. Petersburg: Goslitizdat, 1923–1924.
- "Parody." In *Dictionary of World Literature*, edited by Joseph T. Shipley, 298–299. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams, 1972.
- Peskov, A. M. "U istokov russkogo filosofstvovaniia: Shellingianskie tainstva liubomudrov" [On the sources of philosophic discussions in Russia: The lovers of wisdom's mysteries in the spirit of Schelling]. *Voprosy filosofii* 5 (1994): 89–118.
- . "U istokov russkogo filosofstvovaniia: Russkaia ideia S. P. Shevyreva" [On the sources of philosophic discussions in Russia: S. P. Shevyrev's Russian idea]. *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 7 (1994): 123–139.
- Pinsker, Leo. *Auto-Emancipation*. N.p.: Masada—Youth Zionist Organization of America, 1939.
- . "Auto-Emancipation." In his *Road to Freedom. Writings and Addresses*, introduction by Ben-Zion Netanyahu, 74–106. New York: Scopus Publishing Company, 1944.
- . "Letter to J. L. Gordon." In his *Road to Freedom. Writings and Addresses*, introduction by Ben-Zion Netanyahu, 118. New York: Scopus Publishing Company, 1944.
- . *Mevasser ha-techiya ha-le'umit. "Ha-otoemansipatzia" ve ha-bikkoret 'aleyha, chozrim u-ne'umim, mikhtavim mi-Pinsker ve-elav*. Translated, edited, and introduction by Mordechai Yoali. Tel Aviv: Masada, 1960.
- . [Lev Pinsker]. "Avtoemansipatsiia. Prizyv russkogo evreia k svoim soplemennikam" [Auto-emancipation. A Russian Jew's address to his tribe]. In Teodor Gerts'l', *Evreiskoe gosudarstvo. Opyt sovremennogo resheniia*

- evreiskogo voprosa* [The Jewish state. An attempt of modern solution to the Jewish question], edited by S. Gorodetskii and O. Libkin, introduction by Khaim Ben-Iakov, 141–186. Moscow: Tekst, 2008.
- Presniakov, O. P. *Poetika poznaniia i tvorchestva: Teoriia slovesnosti A. Potebni* [The poetics of cognition and creativity: A. Potebnia's theory of literature]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1980.
- Proskurina, V. Iu. "O zhizni i myshlenii P. Ia. Chaadaeva" [Life and thought of Petr Chaadaev]. Introduction to P. Ia. Chaadaev, *Izbrannye sochineniia i pis'ma* [Selected works and letters], 3–20. Moscow: Pravda, 1991.
- Rosenbloom, Noach Chaim. *Ha-epos ha-mikra'i me-'idan ha-Haskalah ve-ha-parshanut* [The biblical epic in the Haskalah and exegesis]. Jerusalem: Rubin Mass, 1983.
- Rosenstock-Huessy, Eugen. *Die europäische Revolutionen und der Charakter der Nationen* [The European revolutions and the character of the nations]. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1951.
- Rosenthal, Olivia. "Épopée et roman dans les discours théoriques en France (XVIème-XVIIème siècles)" [French theories of the epic and the novel in the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries]. In *Plaisir de l'épopée* [The pleasure of the epic], edited by Gisele Mathieu-Castellani, 173–188. Saint-Denis: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 2000.
- Safranski, Ruediger. *Romanticism: A German Affair*. Translated by Robert E. Goodwin. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press, 2014.
- Saltykov-Shchedrin, M. E. "Nasha obshchestvennaia zhizn', 1863–1864" [Our Public Life, 1863–1863]. In his *Sobranie sochinenii v dvadtsati tomakh* [Collected works in twenty volumes], vol. 6, 7–352. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1965–1977.
- Shaanan, Avraham. *Ha-sifrut ha-yivrit ha-chadasha li-zerameya* [Trends in modern Hebrew literature]. Tel Aviv: Massadah, 1962–1977.
- Shalev, Meir. *Roman rusi* [The Russian novel]. Tel Aviv: Am Oved, 1989.
- Shapira, Anita. "Hebrew Literature and the Creation of the Zionist Narrative." In *Polish and Hebrew Literature and National Identity*, edited by Alina Moliak and Shoshana Ronen, 19–26. Warsaw: Elipsa, 2010.
- Shapira, Chayyim Nachman. *Toldot ha-sifrut ha-yivrit ha-chadasha* [History of modern Hebrew literature]. Tel Aviv: Massadah, 1940.
- Shavit, Uzi. *Shira ve-ideo'ologia* [Poetry and ideology]. Tel Aviv: Ha-Kibbutz ha-meuchad and Keter, 1987.
- Shklovsky, V. B. [V. B. Shklovskii]. *Khudozhestvennaia proza: Razmyshleniia i razbory* [Prose fiction: Reflections and Analyses]. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1959.

- . “The Novel as Parody: Sterne’s *Tristram Shandy*.” In his *Theory of Prose*, translated by Benjamin Sher, 147–170. Normal, IL: Dalkey Archive Press, 1990.
- “Slavianofil’stvo” [Slavophilia]. In *Slovar’ filosofskikh terminov* [Dictionary of philosophical terms], edited by V. G. Kuznetsov, 511–513. Moscow: Infra-M, 2007.
- Smadja, Robert. *Introduction a la philosophie de la literature: La literature dans les limites de la simple raison* [Introduction to the philosophy of literature. Literature within the limits of the simple logic]. Paris: Honore Champion, 2009.
- Smolenskin, Peretz Ben-Moshe. “Am Olam” [People of eternity]. In his *Ma’amarim* [Articles], vol. 1, 1–162. Jerusalem: Keren Smolenskin, 1925.
- Smolenskin, Peretz Ben-Moshe. “Et lata’at” [It’s time to plant]. In his *Ma’amarim* [Articles], vol. 2, 1–290. Jerusalem: Keren Smolenskin, 1925.
- Stanislawski, Michael. *For Whom Do I Toil: Judah Leib Gordon and the Crisis of Russian Jewry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Trotsky, Leon. *Literature and Revolution*. Translated by Rose Strunsky. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968.
- . [Lev Trotskii]. *Literatura i revoliutsiia* [Literature and revolution]. Moscow: Politizdat, 1991.
- Tsimbareva, N. I. “Vstuplenie” [Introduction]. In Iu. F. Samarin, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia* [Selected works], edited by N. I. Tsimbareva, 3–22. Moscow: Moskovskii filosofskii fond, 1996.
- Warner, Martin. “Philosophy and Literature: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow.” *Ratio: An International Journal of Analytic Philosophy* 22, no. 4 (2009): special issue *Philosophy of Literature*, edited by Severin Schroeder, 486–507.
- Wessely, Naphtali Herz. *Shirei tif’eret* [Songs of glory]. Berlin: Chevrat chinukh li-ne’arim, 1789.
- Venevitinov, D. V. *Stikhotvoreniia. Proza* [Poems. Prose]. Moscow: Nauka, 1980.
- Zamaleev, A. F. “Tri lika Rossii” [Three faces of Russia]. In *Rossiia glazami russkogo. Chaadaev, Leont’ev, Solov’ev* [Russia through the Eyes of a Russian. Chaadayev, Leontyev, Solovyev], edited and introduced by A. F. Zamaleev, 5–16. St. Petersburg: Rossiiskaia akademiia nauk, 1991.

Index

A

Abramson, Yaakov, 82
Aksakov, Ivan, 10, 17, 21–23
Aksakov, Konstantin, 10, 25, 54, 56
Aksakov, Sergey, 54n92
Aliyah, 82
Antisemitic Literature, 21
Austro-Hungarian Empire, 19, 24
Auto-Emancipation, 20, 59

B

Babel, Tower of, 48–49
Babylon, 48
Bakhtin, Mikhail, 76
Barel, Yehudit, 93
Belinsky, Vissarion, 29, 33
Ben-Yehuda, Eliezer, 19–20
Berdyayev, Nikolai, 11, 64–66
Berkowitz, Yizhak Dov, 2
Bezlepkin, Nikolai, 48
Bialik, Chayyim Nahman, 2, 84–85
Bible, 91–93, 95–96
Bloom, Harold, 89
Bolshevik Revolution. *See* October Revolution
Brenner, Yosef Chayyim, 2, 81–82
Around the Dot, 82
From Here and There, 82
Broides, Reuven Asher, 81
Budnitsky, Oleg, 79n17
Bulgakov, Mikhail, 73–74
Master and Margarita, 73–74
White Guard, The, 74

C

Catholicism, 17
Chaadayev, Petr, 25, 33–34, 51–53, 55–57, 59–62, 64, 67, 69
Chernyshevsky, Nikolai, 73
What Is to be Done?, 73
Chibbat Zion, 20, 26, 29, 57
Chovevei Zion, 23, 27–28
Christianity, 12, 32, 79–80
Civil War, 78–80
Crimean War, 14

D

Den' (Day), 22
Dostoyevsky, Fyodor, 15–16, 43, 72, 74, 76, 81–82
Brothers Karamazov, The, 74, 76
Crime and Punishment, 74, 76
Devils, The, 74
Youngster, 74

E

Eastern Europe, 2, 6–7, 9, 16–18, 20, 23, 29, 41, 56–57, 60, 64, 84
Egypt, 45
England, 45
Enlightenment, 1–2, 9–10, 19, 23, 28, 33, 46, 52, 57, 91, 101
Epokha (Age), 15
Eretz Yisrael, 89
Ettinger, Samuel, 21–23
Exodus from Egypt, 91, 95, 101

F

Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 47
 Flaubert, Gustave, 101
 France, 27, 45

G

Germany, 22, 27, 45, 90
 Gogol, Nikolai, 15
Golos (Voice), 26
 Gordon, Yehuda Leib, 1, 18, 23, 25–32, 34–49, 51–57
Flask of Feuilletons, The, 26–28
 Gorky, Maxim, 85
 Graetz, Heirich Zvi, 91
 Granovsky, Timofey, 14
 Grigoryev, Appolon, 14–15

H

Ha-Melitz, 27
 Ha-Shahar, 20
 Habsburg Empire, 18
 Halkin, Shimon, 93
 HaMelitz, 26
 Haskalah, 3, 19–21, 25–26, 28–30, 38, 56–57, 81, 91, 93, 101
 Hazaz, Chayyim, 2, 78, 80, 86
Rushing River, A, 86
Shemuel Frankfurter, 78–80
 Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 8, 47
 Hellenizers, 36
 Herbart, Johann, 47
 Herder, Johann Gottfried von, 41, 91–92
 Herzen, Alexandr, 12, 14, 16
 Holocaust, 77, 89
 Humboldt, Friedrich Wilhelm von, 41, 47–48

I

Israel, 20, 27–28, 47, 51–52, 61, 86
 Italy, 45
 Ivanov, Vyacheslav, 68

J

Jerusalem, 82
 Jesus, 21, 38, 76
 Jewry, 26–27, 42, 44, 89
 Judaism, 2–3, 21–22, 36, 42, 45, 52, 79–80, 88
 Judas Iscariot, 38, 76
 Judea, 68
 Judeophobia, 60

K

Kant, Immanuel, 47
 Khomiakov, Aleksey, 10–12, 16, 21–22, 25, 30–32, 34–46, 48–50, 52–54, 56, 59, 62–64, 69
 Kievan Rus, 31n24, 55n95
 Kireyevsky, Ivan, 10, 14, 26
 Kishinev Pogroms, 84
 Klausner, Joseph, 21, 27n14, 92
 Klopstock, Friedrich, 91–92, 101, 103
Messiad, 91–92, 101, 103

L

Lachover, Fishel, 91–92
 Lermontov, Mikhail, 14, 72, 83–84
Hero of Our Time, A, 72
Literaturnaia gazeta (Literary newspaper), 85
 Lotze, Rudolf Hermann, 47
 Lovers of Wisdom, 9–10, 26, 49, 51, 55
 Lyubomudry (Wisdom movement), 9

M

Mapu, Abraham, 81
 Maskilim, 19, 22, 25, 28, 46, 48, 52,
 55–56
 Midrash, 91
 Mirkin, Yaakov, 87
 Mongol Empire, 55n95
 Moscow, 13–14, 32, 49, 72
 Moses, 38, 91, 93, 95–96, 101, 104

N

Nachman, Chayyim, 84, 92
 Nagibin, Yury, 73
 My Golden Mother-in-Law, 73
 Napoleon, 7
 Napoleonic Wars, 8
 Nazis, 86
 New Testament, 79
 Novgorod, 31

O

Odoevsky, Vladimir, 9
 October (Bolshevik) Revolution,
 79n17, 85
 Orthodox Church, 12–13, 15, 27
 Ostrovsky, Nikolai, 14–15
 Ovsyaniko-Kulikovsky, Dmitry, 69

P

Palestine, 22, 82, 86–87
 Peter, the Great, 38
 Petersburg, 42, 72
 Pines, Yehiel Michael, 21
 Pinsker, Yehuda Leib, 1, 18–20, 57–65,
 68–69
 Pogroms, 23, 27, 34–35, 40–41, 80, 84
 Poland, 17
 Potebnia, Aleksandr, 41, 47–48
 Purim, 45

Pushkin, Alexander, 15, 103–4
 Eugene Onegin, 103

R

Radishchev, Aleksandr, 72
 Journey from Petersburg to Moscow,
 The, 72
 Romanticism, 9, 47, 90
 Rome, 13
 Russian Empire, 1–2, 6, 18–19, 84
 Russian soul, 10–11, 15–16, 30, 34–35, 65

S

Saltykov-Shchedrin, Mikhail, 16
 Samarin, Yuri, 10, 25, 50–52, 56
 Satan, 76
 Schelling, Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph,
 8–9, 47
 Shaanan, Avraham, 92–93
 Shalev, Meir, 87–88
 Blue Mountain, The (A Russian Novel),
 87
 Shapira, Nachman, 92
 Shevyrev, Stepan, 10, 35
 Shinhar, Baruch, 49, 87
 Sholokhov, Mikhail, 73
 Quiet Flows the Don, 73
 Shteinberg, Ya., 2
 Slavophile movement, 8–12, 17, 21–23,
 25, 28, 30, 32–33, 38, 44–45, 54, 56
 Slavophiles, 12–13, 15, 21–23, 28, 30,
 33, 35, 41, 44–47, 49–52, 54–55, 64,
 69
 Smolenskin, Peretz, 1, 18–20, 24–25, 81
 Soil movement (Pochvenichestvo), 15–
 16, 20, 36, 44, 61
 Soviet Union, 79, 86
Sovremennik (Contemporary), 16
 Stakhov, Nikolai, 17

Stanislawski, Michael, 23
Steinthal, Heymann, 47
Sterne, Lawrence, 102, 104

T

Talmud, 42
Temkin, Asher, 42
Tolstoy, Leo, 15, 72, 74, 80–82
 Childhood, Boyhood, Youth, 72
 False Coupon, The, 74
 Father Sergei, 34
 War and Peace, 74
Tolstoyism, 79
Torah, 47
Transylvania, 18
Turgenev, Ivan, 14

U

Ukraine, 34

V

Venevitinov, Dmitry, 9, 33
Vladimir the Saint, the Great, 31
Voskhod (Down), 31, 40
Vremia (Time), 15–16

W

Wessely, Naphtali Herz, 2–3, 90–94, 96,
 102–4
 Songs of Glory (Shirei Tif'eret), 3, 85,
 90–96, 101–3
Westerners (Westernizers), 13, 43, 69
Westernizers (Zapadniki), 21–22, 27–
 28, 33, 51–52, 56
Westernizing movement, 9, 11, 52

Z

Zionist movement, 2, 27, 57
Zweifel Ha-Kohen, Eliezer, 21